



# The State Bar of California

## Task Force on Access Through Innovation of Legal Services – Subcommittee on Rules and Ethics Opinions

---

To: Rules and Ethics Opinions Subcommittee  
From: Kevin Mohr  
Date: April 18, 2018  
Re: B.5. Consideration of Report and Recommendation: Adoption of amendments to California Rules 7.1-7.5 that conform to ABA Model Rule counterparts 7.1-7.3

During the plenary session of our April 8, 2019 meeting, Mark Tuft recommended that our subcommittee consider the recent changes to the ABA Model Rules on Lawyer Marketing that were adopted on August 6, 2018. Mark noted that the revisions had been made in part to address technology changes in the last couple of decades, in particular the use by lawyers of social media to market their services. I'm am circulating the attached for our consideration at the May 13, 2019 ATILS meeting in Los Angeles.

Attached:

- ABA Model Rules 7.1 to 7.3, CLEAN version, as adopted by the ABA on 8/6/2018.
- ABA Resolution 101 (7/30/18), submitted for consideration by the ABA House of Delegates. This document includes the proposed changes to the rules in legislative redline, with the Report of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in support of the proposal.
- ABA Model Rules 7.1 to 7.3, REDLINE version, comparing ABA Model Rules to California Rules 7.1 to 7.5, TEXT ONLY.
- Excerpt from Richard Zitrin & Kevin E. Mohr, *LEGAL ETHICS: RULES, STATUTES AND COMPARISONS* (Carolina Acad. Press 2019), describing the differences between the ABA Model Rules 7.1 to 7.3 and the California Rules 7.1 to 7.5.

## **MODEL RULE 7.1: COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING A LAWYER'S SERVICES**

**A lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services. A communication is false or misleading if it contains a material misrepresentation of fact or law, or omits a fact necessary to make the statement considered as a whole not materially misleading.**

### **Comment**

[1] This Rule governs all communications about a lawyer's services, including advertising. Whatever means are used to make known a lawyer's services, statements about them must be truthful.

[2] Misleading truthful statements are prohibited by this Rule. A truthful statement is misleading if it omits a fact necessary to make the lawyer's communication considered as a whole not materially misleading. A truthful statement is misleading if a substantial likelihood exists that it will lead a reasonable person to formulate a specific conclusion about the lawyer or the lawyer's services for which there is no reasonable factual foundation. A truthful statement is also misleading if presented in a way that creates a substantial likelihood that a reasonable person would believe the lawyer's communication requires that person to take further action when, in fact, no action is required.

[3] A communication that truthfully reports a lawyer's achievements on behalf of clients or former clients may be misleading if presented so as to lead a reasonable person to form an unjustified expectation that the same results could be obtained for other clients in similar matters without reference to the specific factual and legal circumstances of each client's case. Similarly, an unsubstantiated claim about a lawyer's or law firm's services or fees, or an unsubstantiated comparison of the lawyer's or law firm's services or fees with those of other lawyers or law firms, may be misleading if presented with such specificity as would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the comparison or claim can be substantiated. The inclusion of an appropriate disclaimer or qualifying language may preclude a finding that a statement is likely to create unjustified expectations or otherwise mislead the public.

[4] It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation. Rule 8.4(c). See also Rule 8.4(e) for the prohibition against stating or implying an ability to improperly influence a government agency or official or to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.

[5] Firm names, letterhead and professional designations are communications concerning a lawyer's services. A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its current members, by the names of deceased members where there has been a succession in the firm's identity or by a trade name if it is not false or misleading. A lawyer or law firm also may be designated by a distinctive website address, social media username or comparable professional designation that is not misleading. A law firm name or designation is misleading if it implies a connection with a government agency, with a deceased lawyer who was not a former member of the firm, with a lawyer not associated with the firm or a predecessor firm, with a nonlawyer or with a public or charitable legal services organization. If a firm uses a trade name that includes a geographical name such as "Springfield Legal Clinic," an express statement explaining that it is not a public legal aid organization may be required to avoid a misleading implication.

[6] A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or other professional designation in each jurisdiction.

[7] Lawyers may not imply or hold themselves out as practicing together in one firm when they are not a firm, as defined in Rule 1.0(c), because to do so would be false and misleading.

[8] It is misleading to use the name of a lawyer holding a public office in the name of a law firm, or in communications on the law firm's behalf, during any substantial period in which the lawyer is not actively and regularly practicing with the firm.

**RULE 7.2: COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING  
A LAWYER'S SERVICES: SPECIFIC RULES**

**(a) A lawyer may communicate information regarding the lawyer's services through any media.**

**(b) A lawyer shall not compensate, give or promise anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services except that a lawyer may:**

**(1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule;**

**(2) pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service;**

**(3) pay for a law practice in accordance with Rule 1.17;**

**(4) refer clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer professional pursuant to an agreement not otherwise prohibited under these Rules that provides for the other person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer, if:**

**(i) the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive; and**

**(ii) the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement;  
and**

**(5) give nominal gifts as an expression of appreciation that are neither intended nor reasonably expected to be a form of compensation for recommending a lawyer's services.**

**(c) A lawyer shall not state or imply that a lawyer is certified as a specialist in a particular field of law, unless:**

**(1) the lawyer has been certified as a specialist by an organization that has been approved by an appropriate authority of the state or the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory or that has been accredited by the American Bar Association;  
and**

**(2) the name of the certifying organization is clearly identified in the communication.**

**(d) Any communication made under this Rule must include the name and contact information of at least one lawyer or law firm responsible for its content.**

## **Comment**

[1] This Rule permits public dissemination of information concerning a lawyer's or law firm's name, address, email address, website, and telephone number; the kinds of services the lawyer will undertake; the basis on which the lawyer's fees are determined, including prices for specific services and payment and credit arrangements; a lawyer's foreign language ability; names of references and, with their consent, names of clients regularly represented; and other information that might invite the attention of those seeking legal assistance.

## **Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer**

[2] Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1)-(b)(5), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services. A communication contains a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, character, or other professional qualities. Directory listings and group advertisements that list lawyers by practice area, without more, do not constitute impermissible "recommendations."

[3] Paragraph (b)(1) allows a lawyer to pay for advertising and communications permitted by this Rule, including the costs of print directory listings, on-line directory listings, newspaper ads, television and radio airtime, domain-name registrations, sponsorship fees, Internet-based advertisements, and group advertising. A lawyer may compensate employees, agents and vendors who are engaged to provide marketing or client development services, such as publicists, public-relations personnel, business-development staff, television and radio station employees or spokespersons and website designers.

[4] Paragraph (b)(5) permits lawyers to give nominal gifts as an expression of appreciation to a person for recommending the lawyer's services or referring a prospective client. The gift may not be more than a token item as might be given for holidays, or other ordinary social hospitality. A gift is prohibited if offered or given in consideration of any promise, agreement or understanding that such a gift would be forthcoming or that referrals would be made or encouraged in the future.

[5] A lawyer may pay others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based client leads, as long as the lead generator does not recommend the lawyer, any payment to the lead generator is consistent with Rules 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), and the lead generator's communications are consistent with Rule 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services). To comply with Rule 7.1, a lawyer must not pay a lead generator that states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression that it is recommending the lawyer, is making the referral without payment from the lawyer, or has analyzed a person's legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive the referral. See Comment [2] (definition of "recommendation"). See also Rule 5.3 (duties of lawyers and law firms with respect to the conduct of nonlawyers); Rule 8.4(a) (duty to avoid violating the Rules through the acts of another).

[6] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A legal service plan is a prepaid or group legal service plan or a similar delivery system that assists people who seek to secure legal representation. A lawyer referral service, on the other hand, is any organization that holds itself out to the public as a lawyer referral service. Qualified referral services are consumer-oriented organizations that provide unbiased referrals to lawyers with appropriate experience in the subject matter of the representation and afford other client protections, such as complaint procedures or malpractice

insurance requirements. Consequently, this Rule only permits a lawyer to pay the usual charges of a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A qualified lawyer referral service is one that is approved by an appropriate regulatory authority as affording adequate protections for the public. See, e.g., the American Bar Association's Model Supreme Court Rules Governing Lawyer Referral Services and Model Lawyer Referral and Information Service Quality Assurance Act.

[7] A lawyer who accepts assignments or referrals from a legal service plan or referrals from a lawyer referral service must act reasonably to assure that the activities of the plan or service are compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. Legal service plans and lawyer referral services may communicate with the public, but such communication must be in conformity with these Rules. Thus, advertising must not be false or misleading, as would be the case if the communications of a group advertising program or a group legal services plan would mislead the public to think that it was a lawyer referral service sponsored by a state agency or bar association.

[8] A lawyer also may agree to refer clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer professional, in return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer. Such reciprocal referral arrangements must not interfere with the lawyer's professional judgment as to making referrals or as to providing substantive legal services. See Rules 2.1 and 5.4(c). Except as provided in Rule 1.5(e), a lawyer who receives referrals from a lawyer or nonlawyer professional must not pay anything solely for the referral, but the lawyer does not violate paragraph (b) of this Rule by agreeing to refer clients to the other lawyer or nonlawyer professional, so long as the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive and the client is informed of the referral agreement. Conflicts of interest created by such arrangements are governed by Rule 1.7. Reciprocal referral agreements should not be of indefinite duration and should be reviewed periodically to determine whether they comply with these Rules. This Rule does not restrict referrals or divisions of revenues or net income among lawyers within firms comprised of multiple entities.

### **Communications about Fields of Practice**

[9] Paragraph (c) of this Rule permits a lawyer to communicate that the lawyer does or does not practice in particular areas of law. A lawyer is generally permitted to state that the lawyer "concentrates in" or is a "specialist," practices a "specialty," or "specializes in" particular fields based on the lawyer's experience, specialized training or education, but such communications are subject to the "false and misleading" standard applied in Rule 7.1 to communications concerning a lawyer's services.

[10] The Patent and Trademark Office has a long-established policy of designating lawyers practicing before the Office. The designation of Admiralty practice also has a long historical tradition associated with maritime commerce and the federal courts. A lawyer's communications about these practice areas are not prohibited by this Rule.

[11] This Rule permits a lawyer to state that the lawyer is certified as a specialist in a field of law if such certification is granted by an organization approved by an appropriate authority of a state, the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory or accredited by the American Bar Association or another organization, such as a state supreme court or a state bar association, that has been approved by the authority of the state, the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory to accredit organizations that certify lawyers as specialists. Certification signifies that an objective entity has recognized an advanced degree of knowledge and experience in the specialty area greater than is suggested by general licensure to practice law. Certifying organizations may be

expected to apply standards of experience, knowledge and proficiency to ensure that a lawyer's recognition as a specialist is meaningful and reliable. To ensure that consumers can obtain access to useful information about an organization granting certification, the name of the certifying organization must be included in any communication regarding the certification.

### **Required Contact Information**

[12] This Rule requires that any communication about a lawyer or law firm's services include the name of, and contact information for, the lawyer or law firm. Contact information includes a website address, a telephone number, an email address or a physical office location.

### **MODEL RULE 7.3: SOLICITATION OF CLIENTS**

(a) "Solicitation" or "solicit" denotes a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.

(b) A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment by live person-to-person contact when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's or law firm's pecuniary gain, unless the contact is with a:

(1) lawyer;

(2) person who has a family, close personal, or prior business or professional relationship with the lawyer or law firm; or

(3) person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered by the lawyer.

(c) A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment even when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph (b), if:

(1) the target of the solicitation has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer; or

(2) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment.

(d) This Rule does not prohibit communications authorized by law or ordered by a court or other tribunal.

(e) Notwithstanding the prohibitions in this Rule, a lawyer may participate with a prepaid or group legal service plan operated by an organization not owned or directed by the lawyer that uses live person-to-person contact to enroll members or sell subscriptions for the plan from persons who are not known to need legal services in a particular matter covered by the plan.

### **Comment**

[1] Paragraph (b) prohibits a lawyer from soliciting professional employment by live person-to-person contact when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's or the law firm's pecuniary gain. A lawyer's communication is not a solicitation if it is directed to the general public, such as through a billboard, an Internet banner advertisement, a website or a television commercial, or if it is in response to a request for information or is automatically generated in response to electronic searches.

[2] "Live person-to-person contact" means in-person, face-to-face, live telephone and other real-time visual or auditory person-to-person communications where the person is subject to a direct personal encounter without time for reflection. Such person-to-person contact does not include chat rooms, text messages or other written communications that recipients may easily disregard. A potential for overreaching exists when a lawyer, seeking pecuniary gain, solicits a person known to be in need of legal services. This form of contact subjects a person to the private importuning of the trained advocate in a direct interpersonal encounter. The person, who may already feel overwhelmed by the circumstances giving rise to the need for legal services, may find it difficult to fully evaluate all available alternatives with reasoned judgment and appropriate self-interest in the face of the lawyer's presence and insistence upon an immediate response. The situation is fraught with the possibility of undue influence, intimidation, and over-reaching.

[3] The potential for overreaching inherent in live person-to-person contact justifies its prohibition, since lawyers have alternative means of conveying necessary information. In particular, communications can be mailed or transmitted by email or other electronic means that do not violate other laws. These forms of communications make it possible for the public to be informed about the need for legal services, and about the qualifications of available lawyers and law firms, without subjecting the public to live person-to-person persuasion that may overwhelm a person's judgment.

[4] The contents of live person-to-person contact can be disputed and may not be subject to third-party scrutiny. Consequently, they are much more likely to approach (and occasionally cross) the dividing line between accurate representations and those that are false and misleading.

[5] There is far less likelihood that a lawyer would engage in overreaching against a former client, or a person with whom the lawyer has a close personal, family, business or professional relationship, or in situations in which the lawyer is motivated by considerations other than the lawyer's pecuniary gain. Nor is there a serious potential for overreaching when the person contacted is a lawyer or is known to routinely use the type of legal services involved for business purposes. Examples include persons who routinely hire outside counsel to represent the entity; entrepreneurs who regularly engage business, employment law or intellectual property lawyers; small business proprietors who routinely hire lawyers for lease or contract issues; and other people who routinely retain lawyers for business transactions or formations. Paragraph (b) is not intended to prohibit a lawyer from participating in constitutionally protected activities of public or charitable legal-service organizations or bona fide political, social, civic, fraternal, employee or trade organizations whose purposes include providing or recommending legal services to their members or beneficiaries.

[6] A solicitation that contains false or misleading information within the meaning of Rule 7.1, that involves coercion, duress or harassment within the meaning of Rule 7.3 (c)(2), or that involves contact with someone who has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer within the meaning of Rule 7.3(c)(1) is prohibited. Live, person-to-person contact of

individuals who may be especially vulnerable to coercion or duress is ordinarily not appropriate, for example, the elderly, those whose first language is not English, or the disabled.

[7] This Rule does not prohibit a lawyer from contacting representatives of organizations or groups that may be interested in establishing a group or prepaid legal plan for their members, insureds, beneficiaries or other third parties for the purpose of informing such entities of the availability of and details concerning the plan or arrangement which the lawyer or lawyer's firm is willing to offer. This form of communication is not directed to people who are seeking legal services for themselves. Rather, it is usually addressed to an individual acting in a fiduciary capacity seeking a supplier of legal services for others who may, if they choose, become prospective clients of the lawyer. Under these circumstances, the activity which the lawyer undertakes in communicating with such representatives and the type of information transmitted to the individual are functionally similar to and serve the same purpose as advertising permitted under Rule 7.2.

[8] Communications authorized by law or ordered by a court or tribunal include a notice to potential members of a class in class action litigation.

[9] Paragraph (e) of this Rule permits a lawyer to participate with an organization which uses personal contact to enroll members for its group or prepaid legal service plan, provided that the personal contact is not undertaken by any lawyer who would be a provider of legal services through the plan. The organization must not be owned by or directed (whether as manager or otherwise) by any lawyer or law firm that participates in the plan. For example, paragraph (e) would not permit a lawyer to create an organization controlled directly or indirectly by the lawyer and use the organization for the person-to-person solicitation of legal employment of the lawyer through memberships in the plan or otherwise. The communication permitted by these organizations must not be directed to a person known to need legal services in a particular matter, but must be designed to inform potential plan members generally of another means of affordable legal services. Lawyers who participate in a legal service plan must reasonably assure that the plan sponsors are in compliance with Rules 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 (c).



The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

**REVISED 101**

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL  
RESPONSIBILITY**

**REPORT TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES**

**RESOLUTION**

- 1 RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association amends Rules 7.1 through 7.5 and
- 2 Comments of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct as follows (insertions
- 3 underlined, deletions ~~struck through~~):

## REVISED 101

### Rules 7.1 through 7.5 and Comments of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct (August 2018)

#### Model Rule 7.1: Communications Concerning A Lawyer's Services

A lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services. A communication is false or misleading if it contains a material misrepresentation of fact or law, or omits a fact necessary to make the statement considered as a whole not materially misleading.

#### Comment

[1] This Rule governs all communications about a lawyer's services, including advertising. ~~permitted by Rule 7.2.~~ Whatever means are used to make known a lawyer's services, statements about them must be truthful.

[2] ~~Truthful statements that are~~ Mmisleading truthful statements are also prohibited by this Rule. A truthful statement is misleading if it omits a fact necessary to make the lawyer's communication considered as a whole not materially misleading. A truthful statement is ~~also~~ misleading if ~~there is~~ a substantial likelihood exists that it will lead a reasonable person to formulate a specific conclusion about the lawyer or the lawyer's services for which there is no reasonable factual foundation. A truthful statement is also misleading if presented in a way that creates a substantial likelihood that a reasonable person would believe the lawyer's communication requires that person to take further action when, in fact, no action is required.

~~[3] It is misleading for a communication to provide information about a lawyer's fee without indicating the client's responsibilities for costs, if any. If the client may be responsible for costs in the absence of a recovery, a communication may not indicate that the lawyer's fee is contingent on obtaining a recovery unless the communication also discloses that the client may be responsible for court costs and expenses of litigation. See Rule 1.5(c).~~

[3]~~[4] An advertisement~~ A communication that truthfully reports a lawyer's achievements on behalf of clients or former clients may be misleading if presented so as to lead a reasonable person to form an unjustified expectation that the same results could be obtained for other clients in similar matters without reference to the specific factual and legal circumstances of each client's case. Similarly, an unsubstantiated claim about a lawyer's or law firm's services or fees, or an unsubstantiated comparison of the lawyer's or law firm's services or fees with the services or fees those of other lawyers or law firms, may be misleading if presented with such specificity as would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the comparison or claim can be substantiated. The inclusion of an appropriate disclaimer or qualifying language may preclude a finding that a statement is likely to create unjustified expectations or otherwise mislead the public.

## REVISED 101

[4]~~[5]~~ It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation. Rule 8.4(c). See also Rule 8.4(e) for the prohibition against stating or implying an ability to improperly influence ~~improperly~~ a government agency or official or to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.

~~[5]~~~~[6]~~ Firm names, letterhead and professional designations are communications concerning a lawyer's services. A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its current members, by the names of deceased members where there has been a succession in the firm's identity or by a trade name if it is not false or misleading. A lawyer or law firm also may be designated by a distinctive website address, social media username or comparable professional designation that is not misleading. A law firm name or designation is misleading if it implies a connection with a government agency, with a deceased lawyer who was not a former member of the firm, with a lawyer not associated with the firm or a predecessor firm, with a nonlawyer or with a public or charitable legal services organization. If a firm uses a trade name that includes a geographical name such as "Springfield Legal Clinic," an express statement explaining that it is not a public legal aid organization may be required to avoid a misleading implication.

~~[6]~~~~[7]~~ A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or other professional designation in each jurisdiction.

~~[7]~~~~[8]~~ Lawyers may not imply or hold themselves out as practicing together in one firm when they are not a firm, as defined in Rule 1.0(c), because to do so would be false and misleading.

~~[8]~~~~[9]~~ It is misleading to use the name of a lawyer holding a public office in the name of a law firm, or in communications on the law firm's behalf, during any substantial period in which the lawyer is not actively and regularly practicing with the firm.

### **Rule 7.2: Advertising Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services: Specific Rules**

~~(a) Subject to the requirements of Rules 7.1 and 7.3, a~~ **A** lawyer may advertise ~~communicate information regarding the lawyer's services through written, recorded or electronic communication, including public~~ any media.

~~(b) A lawyer shall not compensate, give or promise anything of value to a person who is not an employee or lawyer in the same law firm~~ for recommending the lawyer's services except that a lawyer may:

(1) pay the reasonable costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule;

## REVISED 101

(2) pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. ~~A qualified lawyer referral service is a lawyer referral service that has been approved by an appropriate regulatory authority;~~

(3) pay for a law practice in accordance with Rule 1.17; and

(4) refer clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer professional pursuant to an agreement not otherwise prohibited under these Rules that provides for the other person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer, if:

(i) the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive; and

(ii) the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement;  
and

(5) give nominal gifts as an expression of appreciation that are neither intended nor reasonably expected to be a form of compensation for recommending a lawyer's services.

(c) A lawyer shall not state or imply that a lawyer is certified as a specialist in a particular field of law, unless:

(1) the lawyer has been certified as a specialist by an organization that has been approved by an appropriate authority of the state or the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory or that has been accredited by the American Bar Association; and

(2) the name of the certifying organization is clearly identified in the communication.

(d) Any communication made under pursuant to this Rule must shall include the name and ~~office address contact information~~ of at least one lawyer or law firm responsible for its content.

### Comment

~~[1] To assist the public in learning about and obtaining legal services, lawyers should be allowed to make known their services not only through reputation but also through organized information campaigns in the form of advertising. Advertising involves an active quest for clients, contrary to the tradition that a lawyer should not seek clientele. However, the public's need to know about legal services can be fulfilled in part through advertising. This need is particularly acute in the case of persons of moderate means who have not made extensive use of legal services. The interest in expanding public information about~~

## REVISED 101

~~legal services ought to prevail over considerations of tradition. Nevertheless, advertising by lawyers entails the risk of practices that are misleading or overreaching.~~

[1] ~~[2]~~ This Rule permits public dissemination of information concerning a lawyer's or law firm's name, ~~or firm name~~, address, email address, website, and telephone number; the kinds of services the lawyer will undertake; the basis on which the lawyer's fees are determined, including prices for specific services and payment and credit arrangements; a lawyer's foreign language ability; names of references and, with their consent, names of clients regularly represented; and other information that might invite the attention of those seeking legal assistance.

~~[3] Questions of effectiveness and taste in advertising are matters of speculation and subjective judgment. Some jurisdictions have had extensive prohibitions against television and other forms of advertising, against advertising going beyond specified facts about a lawyer, or against "undignified" advertising. Television, the Internet, and other forms of electronic communication are now among the most powerful media for getting information to the public, particularly persons of low and moderate income; prohibiting television, Internet, and other forms of electronic advertising, therefore, would impede the flow of information about legal services to many sectors of the public. Limiting the information that may be advertised has a similar effect and assumes that the bar can accurately forecast the kind of information that the public would regard as relevant. But see Rule 7.3(a) for the prohibition against a solicitation through a real-time electronic exchange initiated by the lawyer.~~

~~[4] Neither this Rule nor Rule 7.3 prohibits communications authorized by law, such as notice to members of a class in class-action litigation.~~

### **Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer**

[2] ~~[5]~~ Except as permitted under paragraphs (b)(1)-(b)(4)(5), lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services. ~~or for channeling professional work in a manner that violates Rule 7.3.~~ A communication contains a recommendation if it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, character, or other professional qualities. Directory listings and group advertisements that list lawyers by practice area, without more, do not constitute impermissible "recommendations."

[3] Paragraph (b)(1) ~~however~~, allows a lawyer to pay for advertising and communications permitted by this Rule, including the costs of print directory listings, on-line directory listings, newspaper ads, television and radio airtime, domain-name registrations, sponsorship fees, Internet-based advertisements, and group advertising. A lawyer may compensate employees, agents and vendors who are engaged to provide marketing or client development services, such as publicists, public-relations personnel, business-development staff, television and radio station employees or spokespersons and website designers.

## REVISED 101

~~[4] Paragraph (b)(5) permits nominal gifts as might be given for holidays, or other ordinary social hospitality. A gift is prohibited if offered or given in consideration of any promise, agreement or understanding that such a gift would be forthcoming or that referrals would be made or encouraged in the future.~~

[4] Paragraph (b)(5) permits lawyers to give nominal gifts as an expression of appreciation to a person for recommending the lawyer's services or referring a prospective client. The gift may not be more than a token item as might be given for holidays, or other ordinary social hospitality. A gift is prohibited if offered or given in consideration of any promise, agreement or understanding that such a gift would be forthcoming or that referrals would be made or encouraged in the future.

~~[5] Moreover, a~~ A lawyer may pay others for generating client leads, such as Internet-based client leads, as long as the lead generator does not recommend the lawyer, any payment to the lead generator is consistent with Rules 1.5(e) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), and the lead generator's communications are consistent with Rule 7.1 (communications concerning a lawyer's services). To comply with Rule 7.1, a lawyer must not pay a lead generator that states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression that it is recommending the lawyer, is making the referral without payment from the lawyer, or has analyzed a person's legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive the referral. See Comment [2] (definition of "recommendation"). See also Rule 5.3 (duties of lawyers and law firms with respect to the conduct of nonlawyers); Rule 8.4(a) (duty to avoid violating the Rules through the acts of another).

[6] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A legal service plan is a prepaid or group legal service plan or a similar delivery system that assists people who seek to secure legal representation. A lawyer referral service, on the other hand, is any organization that holds itself out to the public as a lawyer referral service. Such Qualified referral services are ~~understood by the public to be~~ consumer-oriented organizations that provide unbiased referrals to lawyers with appropriate experience in the subject matter of the representation and afford other client protections, such as complaint procedures or malpractice insurance requirements. Consequently, this Rule only permits a lawyer to pay the usual charges of a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service. A qualified lawyer referral service is one that is approved by an appropriate regulatory authority as affording adequate protections for the public. See, e.g., the American Bar Association's Model Supreme Court Rules Governing Lawyer Referral Services and Model Lawyer Referral and Information Service Quality Assurance Act. ~~(requiring that organizations that are identified as lawyer referral services (i) permit the participation of all lawyers who are licensed and eligible to practice in the jurisdiction and who meet reasonable objective eligibility requirements as may be established by the referral service for the protection of the public; (ii) require each participating lawyer to carry reasonably adequate malpractice~~

## REVISED 101

insurance; (iii) act reasonably to assess client satisfaction and address client complaints; and (iv) do not make referrals to lawyers who own, operate or are employed by the referral service.)

[7] A lawyer who accepts assignments or referrals from a legal service plan or referrals from a lawyer referral service must act reasonably to assure that the activities of the plan or service are compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. ~~See Rule 5.3.~~ Legal service plans and lawyer referral services may communicate with the public, but such communication must be in conformity with these Rules. Thus, advertising must not be false or misleading, as would be the case if the communications of a group advertising program or a group legal services plan would mislead the public to think that it was a lawyer referral service sponsored by a state agency or bar association. ~~Nor could the lawyer allow in-person, telephonic, or real-time contacts that would violate Rule 7.3.~~

[8] A lawyer also may agree to refer clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer professional, in return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer. Such reciprocal referral arrangements must not interfere with the lawyer's professional judgment as to making referrals or as to providing substantive legal services. See Rules 2.1 and 5.4(c). Except as provided in Rule 1.5(e), a lawyer who receives referrals from a lawyer or nonlawyer professional must not pay anything solely for the referral, but the lawyer does not violate paragraph (b) of this Rule by agreeing to refer clients to the other lawyer or nonlawyer professional, so long as the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive and the client is informed of the referral agreement. Conflicts of interest created by such arrangements are governed by Rule 1.7. Reciprocal referral agreements should be of indefinite duration and should be reviewed periodically to determine whether they comply with these Rules. This Rule does not restrict referrals or divisions of revenues or net income among lawyers within firms comprised of multiple entities.

### **Communications about Fields of Practice**

[9] Paragraph (a) of this Rule permits a lawyer to communicate that the lawyer does or does not practice in particular areas of law. A lawyer is generally permitted to state that the lawyer "concentrates in" or is a "specialist," practices a "specialty," or "specializes in" particular fields based on the lawyer's experience, specialized training or education, but such communications are subject to the "false and misleading" standard applied in Rule 7.1 to communications concerning a lawyer's services.

[10] The Patent and Trademark Office has a long-established policy of designating lawyers practicing before the Office. The designation of Admiralty practice also has a long historical tradition associated with maritime commerce and the federal courts. A lawyer's communications about these practice areas are not prohibited by this Rule.



## REVISED 101

[11] This Rule permits a lawyer to state that the lawyer is certified as a specialist in a field of law if such certification is granted by an organization approved by an appropriate authority of a state, the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory or accredited by the American Bar Association or another organization, such as a state supreme court or a state bar association, that has been approved by the authority of the state, the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory to accredit organizations that certify lawyers as specialists. Certification signifies that an objective entity has recognized an advanced degree of knowledge and experience in the specialty area greater than is suggested by general licensure to practice law. Certifying organizations may be expected to apply standards of experience, knowledge and proficiency to ensure that a lawyer's recognition as a specialist is meaningful and reliable. To ensure that consumers can obtain access to useful information about an organization granting certification, the name of the certifying organization must be included in any communication regarding the certification.

### **Required Contact Information**

[12] This Rule requires that any communication about a lawyer or law firm's services include the name of, and contact information for, the lawyer or law firm. Contact information includes a website address, a telephone number, an email address or a physical office location.

### **Model Rule 7.3: Solicitation of Clients**

**(a) "Solicitation" or "solicit" denotes a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.**

**(a) (b) A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment by live person-to-person contact in person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact solicit professional employment when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's or law firm's pecuniary gain, unless the person contacted is with a:**

**(1) is a lawyer; or**

**(2) person who has a family, close personal, or prior business or professional relationship with the lawyer or law firm; or**

**(3) person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered by the lawyer is known by the lawyer to be an experienced user of the type of legal services involved for business matters.**



## REVISED 101

~~(b)(c)~~ A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment ~~by written, recorded or electronic communication or by in person, telephone or real-time electronic contact~~ even when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph (a), if:

(1) the target of the solicitation has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer; or

(2) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment.

~~(c) Every written, recorded or by electronic communication from a lawyer soliciting professional employment from anyone known to be in need of legal services in a particular matter shall include the words "Advertising Material" on the outside envelope, if any, and at the beginning and ending of any recorded or electronic communication, unless the recipient of the communication is a person specified in paragraphs (a)(1) or (a)(2).~~

(d) This Rule does not prohibit communications authorized by law or ordered by a court or other tribunal.

~~(d)(e)~~ Notwithstanding the prohibitions in this Rule ~~paragraph (a)~~, a lawyer may participate with a prepaid or group legal service plan operated by an organization not owned or directed by the lawyer that uses ~~in-person or telephone~~ live person-to-person contact to solicit enroll memberships or sell subscriptions for the plan from persons who are not known to need legal services in a particular matter covered by the plan.

### Comment

[1] ~~A solicitation is a targeted communication initiated by the lawyer that is directed to a specific person and that offers to provide, or can reasonably be understood as offering to provide, legal services. In contrast, a~~ Paragraph (b) prohibits a lawyer from soliciting professional employment by live person-to-person contact when a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's or the law firm's pecuniary gain. A lawyer's communication is typically does not constitute a solicitation if it is directed to the general public, such as through a billboard, an Internet banner advertisement, a website or a television commercial, or if it is in response to a request for information or is automatically generated in response to electronic Internet searches.

[2] "Live person-to-person contact" means in-person, face-to-face, live telephone and other real-time visual or auditory person-to-person communications such as Skype or FaceTime, where the person is subject to a direct personal encounter without time for reflection. Such person-to-person contact does not include chat rooms, text messages or other written communications that recipients may easily disregard. There is a A potential for abuse overreaching exists when a solicitation involves a lawyer, seeking pecuniary

## REVISED 101

~~gain, direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact~~ solicits a person by a lawyer with someone known to be in need of legal services. These ~~This~~ forms of contact subjects a person to the private importuning of the trained advocate in a direct interpersonal encounter. The person, who may already feel overwhelmed by the circumstances giving rise to the need for legal services, may find it difficult to fully evaluate fully all available alternatives with reasoned judgment and appropriate self-interest in the face of the lawyer's presence and insistence upon ~~being retained immediately~~ an immediate response. The situation is fraught with the possibility of undue influence, intimidation, and over-reaching.

[3] ~~This~~ The potential for ~~abuse~~ overreaching inherent in live person-to-person contact ~~direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic solicitation~~ justifies its prohibition, particularly since lawyers have alternative means of conveying necessary information. ~~to those who may be in need of legal services.~~ In particular, communications can be mailed or transmitted by email or other electronic means that ~~do not involve real-time contact~~ and do not violate other laws. ~~governing solicitations.~~ These forms of communications ~~and solicitations~~ make it possible for the public to be informed about the need for legal services, and about the qualifications of available lawyers and law firms, without subjecting the public to live person-to-person ~~direct in-person, telephone or real-time electronic~~ persuasion that may overwhelm a person's judgment.

[4] ~~The use of general advertising and written, recorded or electronic communications to transmit information from lawyer to the public, rather than direct in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact, will help to assure that the information flows cleanly as well as freely. The contents of advertisements and communications permitted under Rule 7.2 can be permanently recorded so that they cannot be disputed and may be shared with others who know the lawyer. This potential for informal review is itself likely to help guard against statements and claims that might constitute false and misleading communications, in violation of Rule 7.1. The contents of live person-to-person direct in-person live telephone or real-time electronic contact can be disputed and may not be subject to third-party scrutiny. Consequently, they are much more likely to approach (and occasionally cross) the dividing line between accurate representations and those that are false and misleading.~~

[5] There is far less likelihood that a lawyer would engage in ~~abusive practices~~ overreaching against a former client, or a person with whom the lawyer has a close personal, or family, business or professional relationship, or in situations in which the lawyer is motivated by considerations other than the lawyer's pecuniary gain. Nor is there a serious potential for ~~abuse~~ overreaching when the person contacted is a lawyer or is known to ~~be an experienced user of~~ routinely use the type of legal services involved for business purposes. ~~For instance, an "experienced user" of legal services for business matters may include those who hire outside counsel to represent the entity; entrepreneurs who regularly engage business, employment law or intellectual property lawyers; small business proprietors who hire lawyers for lease or contract issues; and other people who~~

## REVISED 101

~~retain lawyers for business transactions or formations.~~ Examples include persons who routinely hire outside counsel to represent the entity; entrepreneurs who regularly engage business, employment law or intellectual property lawyers; small business proprietors who regularly routinely hire lawyers for lease or contract issues; and other people who routinely regularly retain lawyers for business transactions or formations. Consequently, the general prohibition in Rule 7.3(a) and the requirements of Rule 7.3(c) are not applicable in these situations. Also, Paragraph (a) is not intended to prohibit a lawyer from participating in constitutionally protected activities of public or charitable legal-service organizations or bona fide political, social, civic, fraternal, employee or trade organizations whose purposes include providing or recommending legal services to their members or beneficiaries.

[6] ~~But even permitted forms of solicitation can be abused. Thus, any A solicitation that which contains false or misleading information which is false or misleading within the meaning of Rule 7.1, that which involves coercion, duress or harassment within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(c)(2), or that which involves contact with someone who has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer within the meaning of Rule 7.3(b)(c)(1) is prohibited. Moreover, if after sending a letter or other communication as permitted by Rule 7.2 the lawyer receives no response, any further effort to communicate with the recipient of the communication may violate the provisions of Rule 7.3(b). Live, person-to-person contact of individuals who may be especially vulnerable to coercion or duress is ordinarily not appropriate, for example, the elderly, those whose first language is not English, or the disabled.~~

[7] This Rule ~~is~~ does not intended to prohibit a lawyer from contacting representatives of organizations or groups that may be interested in establishing a group or prepaid legal plan for their members, insureds, beneficiaries or other third parties for the purpose of informing such entities of the availability of and details concerning the plan or arrangement which the lawyer or lawyer's firm is willing to offer. This form of communication is not directed to people who are seeking legal services for themselves. Rather, it is usually addressed to an individual acting in a fiduciary capacity seeking a supplier of legal services for others who may, if they choose, become prospective clients of the lawyer. Under these circumstances, the activity which the lawyer undertakes in communicating with such representatives and the type of information transmitted to the individual are functionally similar to and serve the same purpose as advertising permitted under Rule 7.2.

[8] ~~The requirement in Rule 7.3(c) that certain communications be marked "Advertising Material" does not apply to communications sent in response to request so potential clients or their spokespersons or sponsors. General announcements by lawyers, including changes in personnel or office location do not constitute communications soliciting professional employment from a client known to be in need of legal services within the meaning of this Rule.~~

## REVISED 101

[8] Communications authorized by law or ordered by a court or tribunal include a notice to potential members of a class in class action litigation.

[9] Paragraph ~~(d)~~ (e) of this Rule permits a lawyer to participate with an organization which uses personal contact to ~~solicit~~ enroll members for its group or prepaid legal service plan, provided that the personal contact is not undertaken by any lawyer who would be a provider of legal services through the plan. The organization must not be owned by or directed (whether as manager or otherwise) by any lawyer or law firm that participates in the plan. For example, paragraph ~~(d)~~(e) would not permit a lawyer to create an organization controlled directly or indirectly by the lawyer and use the organization for the ~~in-person or telephone~~ person-to-person solicitation of legal employment of the lawyer through memberships in the plan or otherwise. The communication permitted by these organizations ~~also~~ must not be directed to a person known to need legal services in a particular matter, but ~~is to~~ must be designed to inform potential plan members generally of another means of affordable legal services. Lawyers who participate in a legal service plan must reasonably assure that the plan sponsors are in compliance with Rules 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3(b)~~(c)~~. See ~~8.4(a)~~.

### **Rule 7.4 Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization (Deleted in 2018.)**

~~(a) A lawyer may communicate the fact that the lawyer does or does not practice in particular fields of law.~~

~~(b) A lawyer admitted to engage in patent practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office may use the designation "Patent Attorney" or a substantially similar designation.~~

~~(c) A lawyer engaged in Admiralty practice may use the designation "Admiralty," "Proctor in Admiralty" or a substantially similar designation.~~

~~(d) A lawyer shall not state or imply that a lawyer is certified as a specialist in a particular field of law, unless:~~

~~(1) the lawyer has been certified as a specialist by an organization that has been approved by an appropriate state authority or that has been accredited by the American Bar Association; and~~

~~(2) the name of the certifying organization is clearly identified in the communication.~~

### **Comment**

~~[1] Paragraph (a) of this Rule permits a lawyer to indicate areas of practice in communications about the lawyer's services. If a lawyer practices only in certain fields, or~~

## REVISED 101

will not accept matters except in a specified field or fields, the lawyer is permitted to so indicate. A lawyer is generally permitted to state that the lawyer is a "specialist," practices a "specialty," or "specializes in" particular fields, but such communications are subject to the "false and misleading" standard applied in Rule 7.1 to communications concerning a lawyer's services.

[2] Paragraph (b) recognizes the long-established policy of the Patent and Trademark Office for the designation of lawyers practicing before the Office. Paragraph (c) recognizes that designation of Admiralty practice has a long historical tradition associated with maritime commerce and the federal courts.

[3] Paragraph (d) permits a lawyer to state that the lawyer is certified as a specialist in a field of law if such certification is granted by an organization approved by an appropriate state authority or accredited by the American Bar Association or another organization, such as a state bar association, that has been approved by the state authority to accredit organizations that certify lawyers as specialists. Certification signifies that an objective entity has recognized an advanced degree of knowledge and experience in the specialty area greater than is suggested by general licensure to practice law. Certifying organizations may be expected to apply standards of experience, knowledge and proficiency to insure that a lawyer's recognition as a specialist is meaningful and reliable. In order to insure that consumers can obtain access to useful information about an organization granting certification, the name of the certifying organization must be included in any communication regarding the certification.

### **Rule 7.5 Firm Names And Letterheads (Deleted in 2018.)**

(a) A lawyer shall not use a firm name, letterhead or other professional designation that violates Rule 7.1. A trade name may be used by a lawyer in private practice if it does not imply a connection with a government agency or with a public or charitable legal services organization and is not otherwise in violation of Rule 7.1.

(b) A law firm with offices in more than one jurisdiction may use the same name or other professional designation in each jurisdiction, but identification of the lawyers in an office of the firm shall indicate the jurisdictional limitations on those not licensed to practice in the jurisdiction where the office is located.

(c) The name of a lawyer holding a public office shall not be used in the name of a law firm, or in communications on its behalf, during any substantial period in which the lawyer is not actively and regularly practicing with the firm.

(d) Lawyers may state or imply that they practice in a partnership or other organization only when that is the fact.

### **Comment**

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

~~[1] A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its members, by the names of deceased members where there has been a continuing succession in the firm's identity or by a trade name such as the "ABC Legal Clinic." A lawyer or law firm may also be designated by a distinctive website address or comparable professional designation. Although the United States Supreme Court has held that legislation may prohibit the use of trade names in professional practice, use of such names in law practice is acceptable so long as it is not misleading. If a private firm uses a trade name that includes a geographical name such as "Springfield Legal Clinic," an express disclaimer that it is a public legal aid agency may be required to avoid a misleading implication. It may be observed that any firm name including the name of a deceased partner is, strictly speaking, a trade name. The use of such names to designate law firms has proven a useful means of identification. However, it is misleading to use the name of a lawyer not associated with the firm or a predecessor of the firm, or the name of a nonlawyer.~~

~~[2] With regard to paragraph (d), lawyers sharing office facilities, but who are not in fact associated with each other in a law firm, may not denominate themselves as, for example, "Smith and Jones," for that title suggests that they are practicing law together in a firm.~~

**REPORT**

**LAWYER ADVERTISING RULES FOR THE 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY**

**I. Introduction**

The American Bar Association is the leader in promulgating rules for regulating the professional conduct of lawyers. For decades, American jurisdictions have adopted provisions consistent with the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, relying on the ABA's expertise, knowledge, and guidance. In lawyer advertising, however, a dizzying number of state variations exist. This breathtaking variety makes compliance by lawyers who seek to represent clients in multiple jurisdictions unnecessarily complex, and burdens bar regulators with enforcing prohibitions on practices that are not truly harmful to the public.<sup>1</sup> This patchwork of advertising rules runs counter to three trends that call for simplicity and uniformity in the regulation of lawyer advertising.

First, lawyers in the 21<sup>st</sup> century increasingly practice across state and international borders. Clients often need services in multiple jurisdictions. Competition from inside and outside the profession in these expanded markets is fierce. The current web of complex, contradictory, and detailed advertising rules impedes lawyers' efforts to expand their practices and thwart clients' interests in securing the services they need. The proposed rules will free lawyers and clients from these constraints without compromising client protection.

Second, the use of social media and the Internet—including blogging, instant messaging, and more—is ubiquitous now.<sup>2</sup> Advancing technologies can make lawyer advertising easy, inexpensive, and effective for connecting lawyers and clients. Lawyers can use innovative methods to inform the public about the availability of legal services. Clients can use the new technologies to find lawyers. The proposed amendments will facilitate these connections between lawyers and clients, without compromising protection of the public.

Finally, trends in First Amendment and antitrust law suggest that burdensome and unnecessary restrictions on the dissemination of accurate information about legal

---

<sup>1</sup> Center for Professional Responsibility Jurisdictional Rules Comparison Charts, *available at*: [https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/policy/rule\\_charts.html](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/policy/rule_charts.html).

<sup>2</sup> See Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers 2015 Report of the Regulation of Lawyer Advertising Committee (2015) [hereinafter APRL 2015 Report], [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional\\_responsibility/aprl\\_june\\_22\\_2015%20report.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/aprl_june_22_2015%20report.authcheckdam.pdf) at 18-19 ("According to a Pew Research Center 2014 Social Media Update, for the 81% of American Adults who use the Internet: 52% of online adults now use two or more social media sites; 71% are on Facebook; 70% engage in daily use; 56% of all online adults 65 and older use Facebook; 23% use Twitter; 26% use Instagram; 49% engage in daily use; 53% of online young adults (18-29) use Instagram; and 28% use LinkedIn.").



## REVISED 101

services may be unlawful. The Supreme Court announced almost forty years ago that lawyer advertising is commercial speech protected by the First Amendment. Advertising that is false, misleading and deceptive may be restricted, but many other limitations have been struck down.<sup>3</sup>

Antitrust law may also be a concern. For nearly 20 years, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has actively opposed lawyer regulation where the FTC believed it would, for example, restrict consumer access to factually accurate information regarding the availability of lawyer services. The FTC has reminded regulators in Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, and Texas that overly broad advertising restrictions may reduce competition, violate federal antitrust laws, and impermissibly restrict truthful information about legal services.<sup>4</sup>

The Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility (SCEPR) is proposing amendments to ABA Model Rules 7.1 – 7.5 that respond to these trends. It is hoped the U.S. jurisdictions will follow the ABA's lead to eliminate compliance confusion and promote consistency in lawyer advertising rules. As amended, the rules will provide lawyers and regulators nationwide with models that continue to protect clients from false and misleading advertising, but free lawyers to use expanding and innovative technologies to communicate the availability of legal services and enable bar regulators to focus on truly harmful conduct. The amended rules will also increase consumer access to accurate information about the availability of legal services and, thereby, expand access to legal services.

## II. Brief Summary of the Changes

The principal amendments:

- Combine provisions on false and misleading communications into Rule 7.1 and its Comments.
- Consolidate specific provisions on advertising into Rule 7.2, including requirements for use of the term “certified specialist”.

---

<sup>3</sup> For developments in First Amendment law on lawyer advertising, see APRL June 2015 Report, *supra* note 2, at 7-18.

<sup>4</sup> The recent decision in *North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. F.T.C.*, 135 S. Ct. 1101 (2015) may be a warning. The Court found that the Board of Dental Examiners exclusion of non-dentists from providing teeth whitening services was anti-competitive and an unfair method of competition in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Court determined that a controlling number of the board members were “active market participants” (i.e., dentists), and there was no state entity supervision of the decisions of the non-sovereign board. Many lawyer regulatory entities are monitoring the application of this precedent as the same analysis might be applicable to lawyers. *See also*, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, *FTC Letters Regarding Lawyer Advertising* (2015), [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/resources/professionalism/professionalism\\_ethics\\_in\\_lawyer\\_advertising/FTC\\_lawyerAd.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/resources/professionalism/professionalism_ethics_in_lawyer_advertising/FTC_lawyerAd.html).



## REVISED 101

- Permit nominal “thank you” gifts under certain conditions as an exception to the general prohibition against paying for recommendations.
- Define solicitation as “a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.”
- Prohibit live, person-to-person solicitation for pecuniary gain with certain exceptions.
- Eliminate the labeling requirement for targeted mailings but continue to prohibit targeted mailings that are misleading, involve coercion, duress or harassment, or that involve a target of the solicitation who has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited.

### III. Discussion of the Proposed Amendments

#### A. Rule 7.1: Communications Concerning a Lawyer’s Services

Rule 7.1 remains unchanged; however, additional guidance is inserted in Comment [2] to explain that truthful information may be misleading if consumers are led to believe that they must act when, in fact, no action is required. ~~New Comment [3] provides that communications that contain information about a lawyer’s fee must also include information about the client’s responsibility for costs to avoid being labeled as a misleading communication.~~

In Comment ~~[4]~~<sup>[3]</sup>, SCEPR recommends replacing “advertising” with “communication” to make the Comment consistent with the title and scope of the Rule. SCEPR expands the guidance in Comment [4] by explaining that an “unsubstantiated claim” may also be misleading. SCEPR also recommends in Comment [5] that lawyers review Rule 8.4(c) for additional guidance.

Comments ~~[6]~~<sup>[5]</sup> through ~~[9]~~<sup>[8]</sup> have been added by incorporating the black letter concepts from current Rule 7.5. Current Rule 7.5(a) restates and incorporates Rule 7.1, and then provides examples of misleading statements. SCEPR has concluded that Rule 7.1, with the guidance of new Comments [6] through [9], better addresses the issues.

#### B. Rule 7.2: Communications Concerning a Lawyer’s Services: Specific Rules

Specific Advertising Rules: Specific rules for advertising are consolidated in Rule 7.2, similar to the current structure of Rule 1.8, which provides for specific conflict situations.

## REVISED 101

SCEPR recommends amendments to Rule 7.2(a) parallel to its recommendations for changes to Comments to Rule 7.1, specifically replacing the term “advertising” with “communication” and replacing the identification of specific methods of communication with a general statement that any media may be used.

Gifts for Recommendations: Rule 7.2(b) continues the existing prohibition against giving “anything of value” to someone for recommending a lawyer. New subparagraph (b)(5), however, contains an exception to the general prohibition. This subparagraph permits lawyers to give a nominal gift to thank the person who recommended the lawyer to the client. The new provision states that such a nominal gift is permissible only where it is not expected or received as payment for the recommendation. The new words “compensate” and “promise” emphasize these limitations: the thank you gift cannot be promised in advance and must be no more than a token item, i.e. not “compensation.”

~~SCEPR’s amendments to Rule 7.2(b) allow lawyers to give something “of value” to employees or lawyers in the same firm. As to lawyers, this new language in Rule 7.2(b) simply reflects the common and legitimate practice of rewarding lawyers in the same firm for generating business. This is not a change; it is a clarification of existing rules. As to employees,~~ SCEPR has concluded that lawyers ought to be permitted to give nominal gifts to non-lawyers, e.g. paralegals who may refer friends or family members to a firm, marketing personnel and others. Rule 5.4 continues to protect against any improper fee sharing. Rule 7.3 protects against solicitation by, for example, so-called “runners,” which are also prohibited by other rules, e.g. Rule 8.4(a).

SCEPR recommends deleting the second sentence Rule 7.2(b)(2) because it is redundant. Comment [6] has the same language.

Specialization: Provisions of Rule 7.4 regarding certification are moved to Rule 7.2(c) and Comments. SCEPR acknowledges suggestions offered by the Standing Committee on Specialization, which shaped revisions to Rule 7.4. Based on these and other recommendations, the prohibition against claiming certification as a specialist is moved to new subdivision (c) of Rule 7.2 as a specific requirement. Amendments also clarify which entities qualify to certify or accredit lawyers. The remaining provisions of Rule 7.4 are moved to Comments [9] through [11] of Rule 7.2. Finally, Comment [9] adds guidance on the circumstances under which a lawyer might properly claim specialization by adding the phrase “based on the lawyer’s experience, specialized training or education.”

Contact Information: In provision 7.2(d) [formerly subdivision (c)] the term “office address” is changed to “contact information” to address technological advances on how a lawyer may be contacted and how advertising information may be presented. Examples of contact information are added in new Comment [12]. All “communications” about a lawyer’s services must include the firm name (or lawyer’s name) and some contact information (street address, telephone number, email, or website address).

## REVISED 101

Changes to the Comments: Statements in Comments [1] and [3] justifying lawyer advertising are deleted. Advertising is constitutionally protected speech and needs no additional justification. These Comments provide no additional guidance to lawyers.

New Comment [2] explains that the term “recommendations” does not include directories or other group advertising in which lawyers are listed by practice area.

New language in Comment [3] clarifies that lawyers who advertise on television and radio may compensate “station employees or spokespersons” as reasonable costs for advertising. These costs are well in line with other ordinary costs associated with advertising that are listed in the Comment, i.e. “employees, agents and vendors who are engaged to provide marketing or client development services.”

New Comment [4] explains what is considered nominal, including ordinary social hospitality. It also clarifies that a gift may not be given based on an agreement to receive recommendations or to make future recommendations. These small and token gifts are not likely to result in the harms addressed by the rule: that recommendation sources might interfere with the independent professional judgment of the lawyer, interject themselves into the lawyer-client relationship, or engage in prohibited solicitation to gain more recommendations for which they might be paid.

Comment [6] continues to address lawyer referral services, which remain limited to qualified entities approved by an appropriate regulatory authority. Description of the ABA Model Supreme Court Rules Governing Lawyer Referral Services is omitted from Comment [6] as superfluous.

The last sentence in Comment [7] is deleted because it is identical to the second sentence in Comment [7] (“Legal services plans and lawyer referral services may communicate with the public, *but such communication must be in conformity with these Rules.*”) (Emphasis added.).

### **C. Rule 7.3: Solicitation of Clients**

The black letter of the current Rules does not define “solicitation;” the definition is contained in Comment [1]. For clarity, a definition is added as new paragraph (a). The definition of solicitation is adapted from Virginia’s definition. A solicitation is:

a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.

Paragraph (b) continues to prohibit direct, in-person solicitation for pecuniary gain, but clarifies that the prohibition applies solely to live person-to-person contact. Comment

## REVISED 101

[2] provides examples of prohibited solicitation including in-person, face-to-face, telephone, and real-time visual or auditory person-to-person communication ~~such as Skype or FaceTime or other face-to-face communications~~. Language added to Comment [2] clarifies that a prohibited solicitation does not include chat rooms, text messages, or any other written communications to which recipients would not feel undue pressure to respond.

The Rule no longer prohibits real-time electronic solicitation because real-time electronic communication includes texts and Tweets. These forms of communication are more like a written communication, which allows the reader to pause before responding and creates less pressure to immediately respond or to respond at all, unlike a direct interpersonal encounter.

Exceptions to live person-to-person solicitation are slightly broadened in Rule 7.3(b)(2). Persons with whom a lawyer has a business relationship—in addition to or separate from a professional relationship—may be solicited because the potential for overreaching by the lawyer is reduced.

Exceptions to prohibited live person-to-person solicitation are slightly broadened in Rule 7.3(b)(3) to include “person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered by the lawyer.” ~~“experienced users of the type of legal services involved for business matters.”~~ Similarly, Comment [5] to Rule 7.3 is amended to explain that the potential for overreaching, which justifies the prohibition against in-person solicitation, is unlikely to occur when the solicitation is directed toward experienced users of the legal services in a business matter.

The amendments retain Rule 7.3(c)(1) and (2), which prohibit solicitation of any kind when a target has made known his or her desire not to be solicited, or the solicitation involves coercion, duress, or harassment. These restrictions apply to both live in-person and written solicitations. Comment [6] identifies examples of persons who may be most vulnerable to coercion or duress, such as the elderly, those whose first language is not English, or the disabled.

After much discussion, SCEPR is recommending deletion of the requirement that targeted written solicitations be marked as “advertising material.” Agreeing with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Professionalism and the Standing Committee on Professional Discipline’s suggestion to review both Oregon’s rules and Washington State’s proposed rules, which do not require such labeling, SCEPR has concluded that the requirement is no longer necessary to protect the public. Consumers have become accustomed to receiving advertising material via many methods of paper and electronic delivery. Advertising materials are unlikely to mislead consumers due to the nature of the communications. SCEPR was presented with no evidence that consumers are harmed by receiving unmarked mail solicitations from lawyers, even if the solicitations are opened by consumers. If the solicitation itself or its contents are

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

misleading, that harm can and will be addressed by Rule 7.1's prohibition against false and misleading advertising.

The statement that the rules do not prohibit communications about legal services authorized by law or by court order is moved from Comment [4] of Rule 7.2 to new paragraph (d) of Rule 7.3.

Amendments were made to Rule 7.3(e) to make the prohibition language consistent with the solicitation prohibition and to reflect the reality that prepaid and group legal service plans enroll members and sell subscriptions to wide range of groups. They do not engage in solicitation as defined by the Rules.

New Comment [8] to Rule 7.3 adds class action notices as an example of a communication that is authorized by law or court order.

### IV. SCEPR's Process and Timetable

The amendments were developed during two years of intensive study by SCEPR, after SCEPR received a proposal from the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL) in 2016.<sup>5</sup> Throughout, SCEPR's process has been transparent, open, and welcoming of comments, suggestions, revisions, and discussion from all quarters of the ABA and the profession. SCEPR's work included the formation of a broad-based working group, posting drafts for comment on the website of the Center for Professional Responsibility, holding public forums at the Midyear Meetings in February 2017 and February 2018, conducting a webinar in March 2018, and engaging in extensive outreach seeking participation and feedback from ABA and state entities and individuals.<sup>6</sup>

#### A. Development of Proposals by the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL) – 2013 - 2016

In 2013, APRL created a Regulation of Lawyer Advertising Committee to analyze and study lawyer advertising rules. That committee studied the ABA Model Rules and various state approaches to regulating lawyer advertising and made recommendations aimed at bringing rationality and uniformity to the regulation of lawyer advertising and disciplinary enforcement. APRL's committee consisted of former and current bar regulators, law school professors, authors of treatises on the law of lawyering, and lawyer-experts in the field of professional responsibility and legal ethics. Liaisons to the

---

<sup>5</sup> APRL's April 26, 2016 Supplemental Report can be accessed here:

[https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional\\_responsibility/aprl\\_april\\_26\\_2016%20report.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/aprl_april_26_2016%20report.authcheckdam.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> Written comments were received through the CPR website. SCEPR studied them all. Those comments are available here:

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/committees\\_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc\\_rule71\\_72\\_73\\_74\\_75/modelrule7\\_1\\_7\\_5comments.html](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/committees_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc_rule71_72_73_74_75/modelrule7_1_7_5comments.html).

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

committee from the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility and the National Organization of Bar Counsel (“NOBC”) provided valuable advice and comments.

The APRL committee obtained, with NOBC’s assistance, empirical data derived from a survey sent to bar regulators regarding the enforcement of current advertising rules. That committee received survey responses from 34 of 51 U.S. jurisdictions.

APRL’s 2014 survey of U.S. lawyer regulatory authorities showed:

- Complaints about lawyer advertising are rare;
- People who complain about lawyer advertising are predominantly other lawyers and not consumers;
- Most complaints are handled informally, even where there is a provable advertising rule violation;
- Few states engage in active monitoring of lawyer advertisements; and
- Many cases in which discipline has been imposed involve conduct that would constitute a violation of ABA Model Rule 8.4(c).

APRL issued reports in June 2015 and April 2016<sup>7</sup> proposing amendments to Rules 7.1 through 7.5 to streamline the regulations while maintaining the enforceable standard of prohibiting false and misleading communications.

In September 2016 APRL requested that SCEPR consider its proposals for amendments to the Model Rules.

### **B. ABA Public Forum – February 2017**

On February 3, 2017 SCEPR hosted a public forum at the ABA 2017 Midyear Meeting to receive comments about the APRL proposals. More than a dozen speakers testified, and written comments were collected from almost 20 groups and individuals.<sup>8</sup>

### **C. Working Group Meetings and Reports – 2017**

In January 2017, SCEPR’s then chair Myles Lynk appointed a working group to review the APRL proposals. The working group, chaired by SCEPR member Wendy Wen Yun Chang, included representatives from Center for Professional Responsibility (“CPR”) committees: Client Protection, Ethics and Professional Responsibility, Professional Discipline, Professionalism, and Specialization. Liaisons from the National Conference of

---

<sup>7</sup> Links to both APRL reports are available at:

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/committees\\_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc\\_rule71\\_72\\_73\\_74\\_75.html](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/committees_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc_rule71_72_73_74_75.html).

<sup>8</sup> Written submissions to SCEPR are available at:

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/committees\\_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc\\_rule71\\_72\\_73\\_74\\_75/modelrule7\\_1\\_7\\_5comments.html](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/committees_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc_rule71_72_73_74_75/modelrule7_1_7_5comments.html).



The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

Bar Presidents, the ABA Solo, Small Firm and General Practice Division, NOBC, and APRL were also appointed.

Chang provided SCEPR with two memoranda summarizing the various suggestions received for each advertising rule and, where applicable, identified recommendations from the working group.

### D. SCEPR December 2017 Draft

After reviewing the Chang memoranda and other materials SCEPR drafted proposed amendments to Model Rules 7.1 through 7.5, and Model Rule 1.0 (terminology), which were presented to all ABA CPR Committees at the October 2017 Leadership Conference. SCEPR then further modified the proposed changes to the advertising rules based in part on the suggestions and comments of CPR Committees. In December 2017, SCEPR released for comment and circulated to ABA entities and outside groups a new Working Draft of proposed amendments to Model Rules 7.1-7.5.

### E. ABA Public Forum – February 2018

In February 2018, the SCEPR hosted another public forum at the 2018 Midyear Meeting, to receive comments about the revised proposals.<sup>9</sup> The proposed amendments were also posted on the ABA CPR website and circulated to state bar representatives, NOBC, and APRL. Thirteen speakers appeared. Twenty-seven written comments were submitted. SCEPR carefully considered all comments and further modified its proposals.<sup>10</sup>

On March 28, 2018, SCEPR presented a free webinar to introduce and explain the Committee's revised recommendations. More than 100 people registered for the forum, and many favorable comments were received.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Speakers included George Clark, President of APRL; Mark Tuft, Chair, APRL Subcommittee on Advertising; Charlie Garcia and Will Hornsby, ABA Division for Legal Services; Bruce Johnson; Arthur Lachman; Karen Gould, Executive Director of the Virginia State Bar; Dan Lear, AVVO; Matthew Driggs; and Elijah Marchbanks.

<sup>10</sup> All Comments can be found here:

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/committees\\_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc\\_rule71\\_72\\_73\\_74\\_75/modelrule7\\_1\\_7\\_5comments.html](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/committees_commissions/ethicsandprofessionalresponsibility/mrpc_rule71_72_73_74_75/modelrule7_1_7_5comments.html). The full transcript of the Public Forum can be accessed here: [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional\\_responsibility/public\\_hearing\\_transcript\\_complete.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/public_hearing_transcript_complete.authcheckdam.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> An MP3 recording of the webinar can be accessed here:

[https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/multimedia/professional\\_responsibility/advertising\\_rules\\_webinar.authcheckdam.mp3](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/multimedia/professional_responsibility/advertising_rules_webinar.authcheckdam.mp3). A PowerPoint of the webinar is also available: [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional\\_responsibility/webinar\\_advertising\\_powerpoint.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/webinar_advertising_powerpoint.authcheckdam.pdf).

## REVISED 101

### V. The Background and History of Lawyer Advertising Rules Demonstrates Why the Proposed Rules are Timely and Necessary

#### A. 1908 – A Key Year in the Regulation of Lawyer Advertising

Prior to the ABA's adoption of the Canons of Professional Ethics in 1908, legal advertising was virtually unregulated. The 1908 Canons changed this landscape; the Canons contained a total ban on attorney advertising. This prohibition stemmed partially from an explosion in the size of the legal profession that resulted in aggressive attorney advertising, which was thought to diminish ethical standards and undermine the public's perception of lawyers.<sup>12</sup> This ban on attorney advertising remained for approximately six decades, until the Supreme Court's decision in 1977 in *Bates v. Arizona*.<sup>13</sup>

#### B. Attorney Advertising in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

*Bates* established that lawyer advertising is commercial speech and entitled to First Amendment protection. But the Court also said that a state could prohibit false, deceptive, or misleading ads, and that other regulation may be permissible.

Three years later, in *Central Hudson*,<sup>14</sup> the Supreme Court explained that regulations on commercial speech must "directly advance the [legitimate] state interest involved" and "[i]f the governmental interest could be served as well by a more limited restriction . . . the excessive restrictions cannot survive."<sup>15</sup>

In the years that followed, the Supreme Court applied the *Central Hudson* test to strike down a number of regulations on attorney-advertising.<sup>16</sup> The Court reviewed issues such as the failure to adhere to a state "laundry list" of permitted content in direct mail advertisements,<sup>17</sup> a newspaper advertisement's use of a picture of a Dalkon Shield intrauterine device in a state that prohibited all illustrations,<sup>18</sup> and an attorney's letterhead that included his board certification in violation of prohibition against referencing expertise.<sup>19</sup> The court's decisions in these cases reinforced the holding in *Bates*: a state may not constitutionally prohibit commercial speech unless the regulation advances a

---

<sup>12</sup> Robert F. Boden, *Five Years After Bates: Lawyer Advertising in Legal and Ethical Perspective*, 65 MARQ. L. REV. 547, 549 (1982). Mylene Brooks, *Lawyer Advertising: Is There Really A Problem*, 15 LOY. L.A. ENT. L. REV. 1, 6-9 (1994). See also APRL 2015 Report, *supra* note 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Bates v. State Bar of Arizona*, 433 U.S. 350 (1977).

<sup>14</sup> *Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Pub. Service Comm'n of N.Y.*, 447 U.S. 557 (1980).

<sup>15</sup> 447 U.S. at 564.

<sup>16</sup> See APRL 2015 Report, *supra* note 2, at 9-18, for a discussion of these cases.

<sup>17</sup> *In re R.M.J.*, 455 U.S. 191, 197 (1982).

<sup>18</sup> *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*, 471 U.S. 626, 647 (1985).

<sup>19</sup> *Peel v. Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Comm'n*, 496 U.S. 91, 93-94 (1990).



## REVISED 101

substantial state interest, and no less restrictive means exists to accomplish the state's goal.<sup>20</sup>

### C. Solicitation

Unlike advertising, in-person solicitation is subject to heightened scrutiny. In *Ohralik v. Ohio State Bar Ass'n*, the Supreme Court upheld an Ohio regulation prohibiting lawyers from in-person solicitation for pecuniary gain. The Court declared: "[T]he State—or the Bar acting with state authorization—constitutionally may discipline a lawyer for soliciting clients in-person, for pecuniary gain, under circumstances likely to pose dangers that the State has a right to prevent."<sup>21</sup> The Court added: "It hardly need be said that the potential for overreaching is significantly greater when a lawyer, a professional trained in the art of persuasion, personally solicits an unsophisticated, injured, or distressed lay person."<sup>22</sup> The Court concluded that a prophylactic ban is constitutional given the virtual impossibility of regulating in-person solicitation.<sup>23</sup>

*Ohralik's* blanket prohibition on in-person solicitation does not extend to targeted letters. The U.S. Supreme Court held in *Shapero v. Kentucky Bar Ass'n*,<sup>24</sup> that a state may not prohibit a lawyer from sending truthful solicitation letters to persons identified as having legal problems. The Court concluded that targeted letters were comparable to print advertising, which can easily be ignored or discarded.

### D. Commercial Speech in the Digital Age

The *Bates*-era cases preceded the advent of the Internet and social media, which have revolutionized attorney advertising and client solicitation. Attorneys are posting, blogging, and Tweeting at minimal cost. Their presence on websites, Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, and blogs increases exponentially each year. Attorneys are reaching out to a public that has also become social media savvy.

---

<sup>20</sup> *In re R.M.J.*, 455 U.S. 191, 197 (1982); *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*, 471 U.S. 626, 647 (1985); *Peel v. Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Comm'n*, 496 U.S. 91, 93-94 (1990).

<sup>21</sup> *Ohralik v. Ohio State Bar Ass'n*, 436 U.S. 447, 449 (1978).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* at 464–65.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 465-467.

<sup>24</sup> 486 U.S. 466 (1988). *But see, Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc.*, 515 U.S. 618 (1995). The Supreme Court has upheld (in a 5 to 4 decision) a Florida Bar rule banning targeted direct mail solicitation to personal injury accident victims or their families for 30 days. The court found that the timing and intrusive nature of the targeted letters was an invasion of privacy; and, when coupled with the negative public perception of the legal profession, the Florida rule imposing a 30 day "cooling off" period materially advanced a significant government interest. This decision, however, does not support a prophylactic ban on targeted letters, only a restriction as to their timing. *But see, Ficker v. Curran*, 119 F.3d 1150 (4th Cir. 1997), in which Maryland's 30-day ban on direct mail in traffic and criminal defense cases was found unconstitutional, distinguishing *Went for It*, because criminal and traffic defendants need legal representation, time is of the essence, privacy concerns are different, and criminal defendants enjoy a 6th amendment right to counsel.

## REVISED 101

More recent cases, while relying on the commercial speech doctrine, exemplify digital age facts. A 2010 case involves a law firm's challenge to New York's 2006 revised advertising rules, which prohibited the use of "the irrelevant attention-getting techniques unrelated to attorney competence, such as style and advertising gimmicks, puffery, wisps of smoke, blue electrical currents, and special effects, and... the use of nicknames, monikers, mottos, or trade names implying an ability to obtain results in a matter."<sup>25</sup> The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found New York's regulation to be unconstitutional as a categorical ban on commercial speech. The speech was not likely to be misleading.<sup>26</sup> The court noted that prohibiting *potentially misleading* commercial speech might fail the *Central Hudson* test.<sup>27</sup> The court concluded that even assuming that New York could justify its regulations under the first three prongs of the *Central Hudson* test, an absolute prohibition generally fails the prong requiring that the regulation be narrowly fashioned.<sup>28</sup>

In 2011, the Fifth Circuit reached a similar conclusion, ruling that many of Louisiana's 2009 revised attorney advertising regulations contained absolute prohibitions on commercial speech, rendering the regulations unconstitutional due to a failure to comply with the least restrictive means test in *Central Hudson*.<sup>29</sup> The Fifth Circuit applied the *Central Hudson* test to attorney advertising regulations.<sup>30</sup> Although paying homage to a state's substantial interest in ensuring the accuracy of information in the commercial marketplace and the ethical conduct of its licensed professionals, the Fifth Circuit relied

---

<sup>25</sup> *Alexander v. Cahill*, 598 F.3d 79, 84-86 (2d Cir. 2010). The court commented, "Moreover, the sorts of gimmicks that this rule appears designed to reach—such as Alexander & Catalano's wisps of smoke, blue electrical currents, and special effects—do not actually seem likely to mislead. It is true that Alexander and his partner are not giants towering above local buildings; they cannot run to a client's house so quickly that they appear as blurs; and they do not actually provide legal assistance to space aliens. But given the prevalence of these and other kinds of special effects in advertising and entertainment, we cannot seriously believe—purely as a matter of 'common sense'—that ordinary individuals are likely to be misled into thinking that these advertisements depict true characteristics. Indeed, some of these gimmicks, while seemingly irrelevant, may actually serve 'important communicative functions: [they] attract [ ] the attention of the audience to the advertiser's message, and [they] may also serve to impart information directly.'" (Citations omitted.).

<sup>26</sup> *Alexander v. Cahill*, 598 F.3d 79, at 96.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* Note that the court did uphold the moratorium provisions that prevent lawyers from contacting accident victims for a certain period of time.

<sup>29</sup> *Pub. Citizen, Inc. v. La. Attorney Disciplinary Bd.*, 632 F.3d 212, 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Note that the court did uphold the regulations that prohibited promising results, that prohibited use of monikers or trade names that implied a promise of success, and that required disclaimers on advertisements that portrayed scenes that were not actual or portrayed clients who were not actual clients. The court distinguished its holding from New York's in *Cahill* by indicating that the Bar had produced evidence in the form of survey results that supported the requirement that the regulation materially advanced the government's interest in protecting the public.

<sup>30</sup> *Pub. Citizen, Inc. v. La. Attorney Disciplinary Bd.*, 632 F.3d 212 (5th Cir. 2011).

## REVISED 101

on the Supreme Court's decision in *Zauderer* to conclude that the dignity of attorney advertising does not fit within the substantial interest criteria.<sup>31</sup>

[T]he mere possibility that some members of the population might find advertising embarrassing or offensive cannot justify suppressing it. The same must hold true for advertising that some members of the bar might find beneath their dignity.<sup>32</sup>

Florida also revised its attorney advertising rules in light of the digital age evolution of attorney advertising and the commercial speech doctrine. Nonetheless, some of Florida's rules and related guidelines have failed constitutional challenges. For example, in *Rubenstein v. Florida Bar* the Eleventh Circuit declared Florida Bar's prohibition on advertising of past results to be unconstitutional because the guidelines prohibited any such advertising on indoor and outdoor displays, television, or radio.<sup>33</sup> The state's underlying regulatory premise was that these "specific media . . . present too high a risk of being misleading." This total ban on commercial speech again did not survive constitutional scrutiny.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, in *Searcy v. Florida Bar*, a federal court enjoined The Florida Bar from enforcing its rule requiring an attorney to be board certified before advertising expertise in an area of law.<sup>35</sup> The Searcy law firm challenged the regulation as a blanket prohibition on commercial speech, arguing board certification is not available in all areas of practice, including the firm's primary mass torts area of expertise.

## VII. Conclusion

Trends in the profession, the current needs of clients, new technology, increased competition, and the history and law of lawyer advertising all demonstrate that the current patchwork of complex and burdensome lawyer advertising rules is outdated for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. SCEPR's proposed amendments improve Model Rules 7.1 through 7.5 by responding to these developments. Once amended, the Rules will better serve the bar and the public by expanding opportunities for lawyers to use modern technology to advertise their services, increasing the public's access to accurate information about the availability of legal services, continue the prohibition against the use of false and misleading communications, and protect the public by focusing the resources of

---

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 220.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* citing *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel*, 471 U.S. 626, 648 (1985).

<sup>33</sup> *Rubenstein v. Fla. Bar*, 72 F. Supp. 3d 1298 (S.D. Fla. 2014).

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* at 1312.

<sup>35</sup> *Searcy v. Fla. Bar*, 140 F. Supp. 3d 1290, 1299 (N.D. Fla. 2015). Summary Judgment Order available at:

[http://www.floridabar.org/TFB/TFBResources.nsf/Attachments/E8E7FDDE9DBB8DE385257ED5004ABB95/\\$FILE/Searcy%20Order%20on%20Merits.pdf?OpenElement](http://www.floridabar.org/TFB/TFBResources.nsf/Attachments/E8E7FDDE9DBB8DE385257ED5004ABB95/$FILE/Searcy%20Order%20on%20Merits.pdf?OpenElement).

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## **REVISED 101**

regulators on truly harmful conduct. The House of Delegates should proudly adopt these amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara S. Gillers, Chair  
Chair, Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility  
August, 2018

## REVISED 101

### GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

Submitting Entity: Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility

Submitted By: Barbara S. Gillers, Chair

**1. Summary of Resolution.** The SCEPR recommends amendments to Model Rules 7.1 through 7.5 and their related Comments. These amendments:

- Streamline and simplify the rules while adhering to constitutional limitations on restricting commercial speech, protecting the public, and permitting lawyers to use new technologies to inform consumers accurately and efficiently about the availability of legal services.
- Combine the provisions on false and misleading communications into Rule 7.1 and its Comments. The black letter of Rule 7.1 remains unchanged. Provisions of Rule 7.5, which largely relate to misleading communications, are moved into Comments to Rule 7.1.
- Consolidate specific rules for advertising into Rule 7.2, change “office address” to “contact information” (to accommodate technological advances) and delete unrelated or superfluous provisions. Provisions of Rule 7.4 regarding certification are moved to Rule 7.2(c) and its Comments. Lawyer referral services remain limited to qualified entities approved by an appropriate regulatory authority.
- Add a new subparagraph to Rule 7.2(b) as an exception to the general provision against paying for recommendations. The new provision would permit only nominal “thank you” gifts and contains other restrictions.
- Define solicitation as “a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.” Live person-to-person solicitation is prohibited. This includes in-person, face-to-face, telephone, and real-time visual or auditory person-to-person communication ~~such as Skype or FaceTime~~.
- Broaden slightly the exceptions in Rule 7.3(b)(2) and (3) to permit live person-to-person solicitation of routine ~~“experienced~~ users of the type of legal services involved for business matters,” and of “persons with whom a lawyer has a business relationship”. Additional Comments offers guidance on the new terms.
- Eliminate the requirement to label targeted mailings as “Advertising”, but prohibit targeted mailings that are misleading, involve coercion, duress, or harassment, or

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## **REVISED 101**

where the target of the solicitation has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited.

### **2. Approval by Submitting Entity**

The SCEPR approved this recommendation on April 11, 2018.

### **3. Has this or a similar Resolution been submitted to the House or Board previously?**

Yes. All amendments to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct must be approved by the House of Delegates.

### **4. What existing Association policies are relevant to this Resolution and how would they be affected by its adoption?**

Adoption of this resolution would result in amendments to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Goal II of the Association—to improve our profession by promoting ethical conduct—would be advanced by the adoption of this resolution.

### **5. If this is a late Report, what urgency exists which requires action at this meeting of the House?**

N/A

### **6. Status of Legislation (if applicable).**

N/A

### **7. Brief explanation regarding plans for implementation of the policy, if adopted by the House of Delegates.**

The Center for Professional Responsibility will publish amendments to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct and Comments. The Policy Implementation Committee of the Center for Professional Responsibility has in place the procedures and infrastructure to successfully implement any policies that are adopted by the House of Delegates.

### **8. Cost to the Association (both indirect and direct costs):**

None.

### **9. Disclosure of interest:**

N/A.

### **10. Referrals.**

**The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.**

## **REVISED 101**

In February 2017, SCEPR hosted a public forum when it received from the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL) a proposal to amend the lawyer advertising rules. Invitations to attend and comment were extended to ABA entities including:

Bar Activities and Services

Client Protection

Delivery of Legal Services

Election Law

Group and Prepaid Legal Services

Lawyers Referral and Information Services

Lawyers' Professional Liability

Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants

Pro Bono and Public Service

Professional Discipline

Professionalism

Public Education

Specialization

Technology and Information Services

Bioethics and the Law

Commission on Disability Rights

Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence

Hispanic Legal Rights and Responsibilities

Commission on Homelessness and Poverty

Commission on Immigration

Commission on Law and Aging

Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs

Center for Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Commission on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Commission on Women in the Profession

Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice

Antitrust Law

Business Law Section

Civil Rights and Social Justice

Criminal Justice Section

Section of Dispute Resolution

Section of Environment, Energy and Resources

Section of Family Law

Government and Public Sector Lawyers Division

Health Law Section

Infrastructure and Regulated Industries Section

Intellectual Property Law

Section of International Law

Judicial Division

Labor and Employment Law

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

Law Practice Division  
Law Student Division  
Section of Litigation  
Section of Public Contract Law  
Real Property, Trust and Estate Law  
Science and Technology Law  
State and Local Govt. Law  
Section of Taxation  
TTIPS  
YLD  
Forum on Communications Law  
Forum on Construction Law  
Forum on Entertainment and Sports Industries  
Franchising  
Solo Small Firm GP

In December 2017, SCEPR released a Working Draft of its proposal to amend the Model Rules regulating lawyer advertising. Information released also included instructions on how to comment in writing and about the February 2018 public forum the Committee was to host. This was emailed to the state bar associations, state disciplinary agencies and the ethics committees of the following ABA entities:

Antitrust Law  
Business Law  
Criminal Justice  
Dispute Resolution  
Environment, Energy and Resources  
Family Law  
Government and Public Sector Lawyers Division  
Health Law  
Intellectual Property  
International Law  
Judicial Division  
Labor and Employment Law  
Law Practice Division  
Litigation  
Real Property, Trust and Estate Law  
Senior Lawyers  
Solo, Small Firm, and General Practice  
State and Local Govt. Law  
Tort Trial and Insurance Practice  
Young Lawyers Division



The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

## REVISED 101

SCEPR also made its work available to the press and the public. Many news articles about its work appeared in the Lawyers' Manual on Professional Conduct, the ABA Journal, and other legal news outlets.

In February 2018, SCEPR hosted a Public Forum at the Midyear Meeting in Vancouver. More than 50 people attended, many spoke, and many written comments were received. A transcript of the proceedings and all the Comments were posted on the Committee's website.

In March 2018, SCEPR hosted a free webinar on the revisions it made to its proposal to amend the Model Rules. Information was emailed to members of the ABA House of Delegates, state bars, state regulators, and other groups.

### **11. Contact Name and Address Information. (Prior to the meeting contact person information.)**

Barbara S. Gillers, Chair, Standing Committee on Ethics  
and Professional Responsibility  
New York University School of Law  
40 Washington Square South, Room 422  
New York, New York 10012  
W: 212-992-6364  
C: 917-679-5757  
[barbara.gillers@nyu.edu](mailto:barbara.gillers@nyu.edu)

Dennis Rendleman  
Ethics Counsel  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
American Bar Association  
321 North Clark Street, 20th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60654  
T: 312.988.5307  
C: 312.753.9518  
[Dennis.Rendleman@americanbar.org](mailto:Dennis.Rendleman@americanbar.org)

### **12. Contact Name and Address Information. (Who will present the report to the House? Please include name, address, telephone number, cell phone number and e-mail address.)**

Barbara S. Gillers, Chair, Standing Committee on Ethics  
and Professional Responsibility  
New York University School of Law  
40 Washington Square South, Room 422  
New York, New York 10012

The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

**REVISED 101**

W: 212-992-6364  
C: 917-679-5757  
[barbara.gillers@nyu.edu](mailto:barbara.gillers@nyu.edu)

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Summary of Resolution.**

The Resolution proposes changes to Model Rules 7.1 through 7.5, known as the lawyer advertising rules. The changes highlight the American Bar Association's long-standing leadership in promulgating rules for the professional conduct of lawyers generally, and in the rules governing lawyer advertising in particular.

A dizzying number of state variations in the rules governing lawyer advertising exist. There are vast departures from the Model Rules and numerous differences between jurisdictions. These differences cause compliance confusion among intra-state and interstate lawyers and firms, time-consuming and expensive litigation, and enforcement uncertainties for bar regulators. At the same time, changes in the law on commercial speech, trends in the profession including increased cross-border practice and intensified competition from inside and outside the profession, and technological advances demand greater uniformity, more simplification, and focused enforcement.

As amended the rules will provide lawyers and regulators nationwide with models that protect clients from false and misleading advertising, free lawyers to use expanding and innovative technologies for advertising, and enable bar regulators to focus on truly harmful conduct. The amended rules will also increase consumer access to accurate information about the availability of legal services and, thereby, expand access to legal services.

### **2. Summary of the issues which the Resolution addresses.**

The Resolution addresses at least five issues. First, the Resolution addresses the overwhelming variation in the rules governing lawyer advertising by promoting simplified, targeted, and more uniform regulation in this area. Second, the Resolution addresses changes in the profession resulting from increased competition from inside and outside the profession and from increased cross-border practice. Lawyers who serve clients across jurisdictions and clients who need service across jurisdictions will benefit from the proposed changes. Third, the Resolution frees bar regulators to focus on truly harmful conduct: advertising that is misleading, harassing, and coercive. Fourth, the Resolution will increase access to legal services by freeing lawyers and clients to connect via ever-expanding technologies. Finally, the Resolution responds to developments in First Amendment law governing commercial speech and antitrust concerns.

### **3. An explanation of how the proposed policy position will address the issue.**

At least three policies inform the Resolution. First, lawyers and clients should be free to use advancing technology to provide the public with greater access to legal services. Second, lawyer advertising rules should focus on truly harmful conduct: false, deceptive,

## REVISED 101

and misleading statements, harassment, coercion, and invasions of privacy, freeing lawyers of unnecessary restrictions. Finally, bar regulators should be able to concentrate their limited enforcement resources on truly harmful conduct.

#### **4. A summary of any minority views or opposition internal and/or external to the ABA which have been identified.**

Minority opposition has been received from two state bar associations: the Illinois State Bar Association and the New Jersey State Bar Association. There was also opposition, but only on two amendments, from the Connecticut Bar Association Standing Committee on Professional Ethics (the “Connecticut Ethics Committee”). The two amendments opposed by the Connecticut Ethics Committee are: (i) eliminating the labeling requirement and (ii) permitting nominal gifts for recommendations.

That said, proposals to change the Model Rules of Professional Conduct typically generate diverse comments rooted in dissimilar philosophical and drafting approaches. The comments received by SCEPR throughout this process followed that pattern; they reflected divergent approaches toward lawyer advertising. Generally, however, the minority views fell into two categories.

One group of minority views argued that SCEPR’s proposals do not remove enough restrictions on lawyer communications with the public regarding legal services and the availability of legal services. In this group are states and individuals—within and outside the ABA—who argue that the Model Rules should prohibit only false or misleading communications.

The other group thought the opposite was true—that SCEPR’s proposals went too far in lifting regulatory constraints on lawyers. In this group are a handful of individuals and state bar associations that oppose, for example, (i) lifting limitations on communicating with experienced users of legal services in business matters, (ii) permitting nominal gifts for recommendations, and (iii) removing the labelling requirement on targeted mail. Some of these commenters also opposed the simple restructuring of current provisions on firm names and claims about specialization.

SCEPR considered all of these, as well as other comments. After significant study, debate, deliberation, and work, SCEPR concluded that its proposals represent the right mix of regulations to protect the public from false, misleading, and harassing conduct while freeing lawyers to use innovative technologies to communicate accurate information about the availability of legal services, enabling clients to find lawyers using those technologies, and focusing regulators on truly harmful conduct.

# Legislative Redline Version Comparison of ABA Model Rules 7.1 through 7.3 with California Rules 7.1 through 7.5

(Underlines represent additions to, and underlines deletions from the ABA Model Rules)

## Chapter 7. Information about Legal Services

### *Rule 7.1 Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services*

(a) A lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services. A communication is false or misleading if it contains a material misrepresentation of fact or law, or omits a fact necessary to make the ~~statement~~ communication considered as a whole not materially misleading.

(b) The Board of Trustees of the State Bar may formulate and adopt standards as to communications that will be presumed to violate rules 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 or 7.5. The standards shall only be used as presumptions affecting the burden of proof in disciplinary proceedings involving alleged violations of these rules. "Presumption affecting the burden of proof" means that presumption defined in Evidence Code sections 605 and 606. Such standards formulated and adopted by the Board, as from time to time amended, shall be effective and binding on all lawyers.

### *Rule 7.2 Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services: Specific Rules Advertising*

(a) Subject to the requirements of rules 7.1 and 7.3, a A lawyer may ~~communicate~~ information regarding the lawyer's advertise services through any written, recorded or electronic means of communication, including public media.

(b) A lawyer shall not compensate, ~~give or promise or give~~ anything of value to a person\* for the purpose of recommending or securing the lawyer's services of the lawyer or the lawyer's law firm,\* except that a lawyer may:

(1) pay the reasonable\* costs of advertisements or communications permitted by this Rule rule;

(2) pay the usual charges of a legal service services plan or a ~~not-for-profit or~~ qualified lawyer referral service. A qualified lawyer referral service is a lawyer referral service established, sponsored and operated in accordance with the State Bar of California's Minimum Standards for a Lawyer Referral Service in California;

(3) ~~pay~~ for a law practice in accordance with ~~Rule~~ rule 1.17;

(4) ~~refer~~ clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer professional pursuant to an ~~agreement~~ arrangement not otherwise prohibited under these Rules or the State Bar Act that provides for the other person\* to refer clients or customers to the lawyer, if:

(i) ~~the reciprocal referral agreement~~ arrangement is not exclusive; ~~and~~

(ii) ~~the client is informed of the existence and nature of the agreement; and~~ arrangement;

(5) ~~give nominal gifts as an expression of appreciation that are neither intended nor reasonably expected to be a form of compensation for recommending a lawyer's services.~~ offer or give a gift or gratuity to a person\* having made a recommendation resulting in the employment of the lawyer or the lawyer's law firm,\* provided that the gift or gratuity was

not offered or given in consideration of any promise, agreement, or understanding that such a gift or gratuity would be forthcoming or that referrals would be made or encouraged in the future.

(c) A lawyer shall not state or imply that a lawyer is certified as a specialist in a particular field of law, unless:

(1) ~~the lawyer has been certified as a specialist by an organization that has been approved by an appropriate authority of the state or the District of Columbia or a U.S. Territory or that has been accredited by the American Bar Association; and~~

(2) ~~the name of the certifying organization is clearly identified in the communication.~~

~~(d)(c)~~ Any communication made under pursuant to this Rule must rule shall include the name and contact information address of at least one lawyer or law firm\* responsible for its content.

### *Rule 7.3 Solicitation of Clients*

(a) “Solicitation” or “solicit” denotes a communication initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to a specific person the lawyer knows or reasonably should know needs legal services in a particular matter and that offers to provide, or reasonably can be understood as offering to provide, legal services for that matter.

~~(b)(a)~~ A lawyer shall not ~~solicit professional employment by in-person, live person-to-person telephone or real-time electronic contact~~ solicit professional employment when a significant motive for the lawyer’s doing so is the lawyer’s or law firm’s pecuniary gain, unless the contact is with a: person\* contacted:

(1) is a lawyer; or

(2) person who has a family, close personal, or prior ~~business or~~ professional relationship with the lawyer ~~or law firm; or,~~

~~(3) person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered~~

~~(e)(b)~~ A lawyer shall not solicit professional employment by written, recorded or electronic communication or by in-person, telephone or real-time electronic contact even when not otherwise prohibited by paragraph ~~(b)(a)~~, if:

(1) ~~the target of the solicitation~~ person\* being solicited has made known\* to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer; or

(2) ~~the solicitation~~ is transmitted in any manner which involves intrusion, coercion, duress or harassment.

(c) Every written, recorded or electronic communication from a lawyer soliciting professional employment from any person\* known\* to be in need of legal services in a particular matter shall include the word “Advertisement” or words of similar import on the outside envelope, if any, and at the beginning and ending of any recorded or electronic communication, unless the recipient of the communication is a person\* specified in paragraphs (a)(1) or (a)(2), or unless it is apparent from the context that the communication is an advertisement.

~~(d) This Rule does not prohibit communications authorized by law or ordered by a court or other tribunal.~~

~~(e)(d)~~ Notwithstanding the prohibitions in this Rule, paragraph (a), a lawyer may participate with

a prepaid or group legal service plan operated by an organization not owned or directed by the lawyer that uses ~~live in-person-to-person, live telephone or real-time electronic~~ contact to ~~enroll members~~ solicit memberships or ~~sell~~ subscriptions for the plan from persons\* who are not known\* to need legal services in a particular matter covered by the plan.

(e) As used in this rule, the terms “solicitation” and “solicit” refer to an oral or written targeted communication initiated by or on behalf of the lawyer that is directed to a specific person\* and that offers to provide, or can reasonably\* be understood as offering to provide, legal services.

*Rule 7.4 Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization (There is No Model Rule Counterpart to Cal. Rule 7.4.*

*But See MR 7.2(c) and Comments [9] – [11])*

(a) A lawyer shall not state that the lawyer is a certified specialist in a particular field of law, unless:

(1) the lawyer is currently certified as a specialist by the Board of Legal Specialization, or any other entity accredited by the State Bar to designate specialists pursuant to standards adopted by the Board of Trustees; and

(2) the name of the certifying organization is clearly identified in the communication.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), a lawyer may communicate the fact that the lawyer does or does not practice in particular fields of law. A lawyer may also communicate that his or her practice specializes in, is limited to, or is concentrated in a particular field of law, subject to the requirements of rule 7.1.

*Rule 7.5 Firm\* Names and Trade Names (There is No Model Rule Counterpart to Cal. Rule 7.5. But See MR 7.1, Comments [5] – [8])*

(a) A lawyer shall not use a firm\* name, trade name or other professional designation that violates rule 7.1.

(b) A lawyer in private practice shall not use a firm\* name, trade name or other professional designation that states or implies a relationship with a government agency or with a public or charitable legal services organization, or otherwise violates rule 7.1.

(c) A lawyer shall not state or imply that the lawyer practices in or has a professional relationship with a law firm\* or other organization unless that is the fact.

*Rule 7.6 Political Contributions to Obtain Legal Engagements or Appointments by Judges (There is No California Rule Counterpart to MR 7.6)*

~~A lawyer or law firm shall not accept a government legal engagement or an appointment by a judge if the lawyer or law firm makes a political contribution or solicits political contributions for the purpose of obtaining or being considered for that type of legal engagement or appointment.~~





## **DESCRIPTIVE COMPARISON OF ABA MODEL RULES 7.1 TO 7.3 WITH CALIFORNIA RULES 7.1 TO 7.5**

[Excerpted from Richard Zitrin & Kevin E. Mohr, *LEGAL ETHICS, RULES, STATUTES AND COMPARISONS* (Carolina Acad. Press 2019)]

### *ABA Model Rules 7.1 – 7.5*

#### Introduction:

In August 2018, the seventh series of the Model Rules addressing advertising and solicitation of legal business (MR 7.1 through 7.5) underwent a major revision that was intended to (i) focus the rules on prohibiting advertisements and solicitations of legal business that are false and misleading; (ii) streamline the rules by merging two rules, MR 7.4 and 7.5, into MR 7.2 and 7.1, respectively; (iii) eliminate some prohibitions that had become anachronistic in the Internet age (e.g., elimination of former MR 7.3(c) regarding notices on envelopes); (iv) permit solicitation of some persons not reasonably likely to be susceptible to a lawyer's overreaching during "live person-to-person contact"; and (v) move permissive provisions in the text of former MR 7.4 and 7.5 to a comment in MR 7.2 and 7.1, respectively.

This section of the Rules Comparison is organized a bit differently than the other sections. For each rule in the 2002 Model Rules (MR 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5), there is a section entitled "2002 Model Rule Text" that describes the 2002 versions of the text of those Model Rules. Within that section will appear comparisons with the "1989 California Rules" and the "2018 California Rules" as in the other rule comparisons, comparing the relevant 2002 Model Rule to the 1989 California Rules text and 2018 California Rules text, respectively.

A second section, titled "2018 Model Rules Text," describes the changes made to the 2002 Model Rules text in 2018.

A third section is titled "2002 Model Rule Comment." It describes the 2002 comments to the respective model rule. Again, within that section are comparisons with the "1989 California Rules" and the "2018 California Rules" as in the other rule comparisons, comparing the relevant 2002 Model Rule to the 1989 California Rules discussions and 2018 California Rules comments, respectively.

Finally, a fourth section, titled "2018 Model Rules Comment," will describe the changes made to the 2002 Model Rules comments in 2018.

Preliminary Note About 1989 California Rules & Cal. B&P Code Sections on Advertising. The 1989 California Rules had a single rule that addressed the subjects of lawyer advertising and solicitation, former rule 1-400. Moreover, under authority imparted by former rule 1-400(E), the State Bar of California was authorized to promulgate, and did promulgate sixteen "standards" that were not subject to state supreme court approval. These standards raised a rebuttable presumption of a violation of the rules of conduct. As described below, none of these 16 standards has been carried forward *as a standard* in the 2018 California Rules. Instead, the standards have either been moved into the black letter text or comment of a rule or been deleted. A table is provided below, after the comparison of the 2002 Model Rule 7.1 text to the 2018 California Rule text, that indicates the ultimate destination of the former standards.

Further, Cal. B&P Code §§ 6150 — 6159 also address advertising and communication issues, including lawyer referral services.

---

*ABA Model Rule 7.1*

2002 Model Rule Text:

The 1983 version of MR 7.1, titled “Communications Concerning a Lawyer’s Services,” contained the general prohibition against a lawyer making a “false or misleading communication” regarding the lawyer’s services. It also defined a communication that is false or misleading.

In 2002, a revision deleted from the definition of “false or misleading” communications those statements that are likely to create an unjustified expectation about results the lawyer can achieve; state or imply results achieved by means that violate the ethics rules or other law; or compare the lawyer’s services with other lawyers’ services. These provisions were moved into the rule’s Comment as Comments [2], [3], and [4], respectively.

1989 California Rules. Unlike the Model Rules, former rule 1-400(A) expressly defined the word “communication.” Like MR 7.1, former rule 1-400 prohibited and Cal. B&P Code § 6157.1 prohibits false or misleading communications. Regarding advertisements by electronic media, including radio, television and computer networks, Cal. B&P Code § 6158 requires that the advertisement as a whole must not be false, misleading or deceptive, and must be factually substantiated.

Former rule 1-400(D) specifically prohibited communications that: 1) contained any untrue statement; 2) contained any matter, or presented or arranged any matter in a manner or format that was false, deceptive or that tended to confuse, deceive or mislead the public; 3) failed to state facts necessary to make a communications not misleading; 4) failed to state expressly or in context that it was a solicitation; or 5) were coercive, intimidating or harassing.

Cal. B&P Code § 6157.2 specifically prohibits advertisements containing: 1) guarantees regarding the outcome of a matter; 2) statements about attorneys getting quick cash results; 3) impersonations or dramatization of the attorney or of clients without disclosure; 4) spokespersons used without disclosure; and 5) statements concerning contingency fees unless the statements disclose the client’s responsibility, if any, for costs.

In addition, several of the State Bar standards appended to Cal. Rule 1-400 addressed these concerns. Unlike MR 7.1, neither the California rule nor the statutes directly prohibited a comparison of the lawyer’s services with those of another lawyer.

The standards to former rule 1-400 also created a number of presumptions, not found in the Model Rules, that a communication is misleading where the communication: 1) contained guarantees, warranties or predictions regarding the result of the representation; 2) contained testimonials or endorsements without express disclaimers; 3) was delivered to a potential client whom the attorney knew or should reasonably have known is in such a physical, emotional, or mental state that he or she would not be expected to exercise reasonable judgment in retaining counsel; 4) was transmitted at the scene of an accident or the like; 5) implied that the lawyer is participating in a lawyer referral service unless the service is State Bar certified; 6) contained a dramatization without a disclaimer; 7) stated or implied “no fee without recovery” without disclosing whether the client will be liable for costs; 8) stated or implied that a lawyer is able to provide legal services in a language other than English unless the lawyer can actually provide legal services in that language or the communication also states the employment title of the person who speaks such language; and 9) set forth specific fees for a particular service where, in fact, the member charges a greater fee than advertised.

Cal. B&P Code § 6158.1 also creates rebuttable presumptions, not found in the Model Rules,

that an advertisement is misleading where it contains: 1) a message about the ultimate result; 2) displays or portrayals of injuries or accident scenes; and 3) a reference to money received for a client in a particular case or to potential monetary recovery for a prospective client.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.1(a) is identical to MR 7.1 except that it substitutes “communication” for “statement.” Cal. Rule 7.2(b) authorizes the State Bar Board of Trustees to formulate and adopt standards, similar to the 16 standards the former Board of Governors promulgated under former rule 1-400. Compare former rule 1-400(E). However, as those 16 standards have now been eliminated, converted to rule text, or moved into comments to rules 7.1 through 7.5, it is uncertain whether or to what extent the Board will exercise its authority.

Table Showing Location of Former Rule 1-400 Standards	
Former Standard	New Location, If Any
(1)	Rule 7.1 Comment [2]
(2)	Rule 7.1 Comment [4]
(3)	Deleted (but see Rule 7.3(b)(2))
(4)	Deleted
(5)	Rule 7.3(c)
(6)	Rule 7.5(b)
(7)	Rule 7.5(c)
(8)	But compare Rule 7.5(c)
(9)	Deleted
(10)	Deleted
Table Showing Location of Former Rule 1-400 Standards ( <i>continued</i> )	
(11)	Deleted
(12)	Rule 7.2(c)
(13)	Deleted (but see Bus. & Prof.C

Table Showing Location of Former Rule 1-400 Standards	
Former Standard	New Location, If Any
	§6157.2(c))
(14)	Rule 7.1, Comment [3]
(15)	Rule 7.1, Comment [5]
(16)	Rule 7.2, Comment [1]

#### 2018 Model Rule Text:

2018 MR 7.1 is identical to the 2002 version of the rule.

#### 2002 Model Rule Comment:

The 2002 version of MR 7.1 had four comments, including Comments [2], [3], and [4] added in 2002 that, as noted, converted prohibitions in the 1983 text into comments. In 2012, Comment [3] was amended to substitute “the public” for the phrase “a prospective client.” See discussion of the definition of “prospective client” under the Model Rule 1.18 comparison, above.

1989 California Rules. There was no Discussion accompanying former rule 1-400.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.1 includes five comments. Comments [1], [3] and [4] are derived from MR 7.1, Cmts. [1], [2] and [3], respectively. Comment [1] also adds a definition of “communication” that is similar to the definition set out in the introductory clause of former rule 1-400(A). Comment [2] addresses a “guarantee or warranty” and provides a reference to Cal. B&P § 6157.2(a). Compare former rule 1-400, Standard (1). Comment [5] carries forward the substance of former rule 1-400, Standard (15).

#### 2018 Model Rule Comment:

2018 MR 7.1, in addition to the four comments in the 2002 version of MR 7.1, includes four comments derived from either the text or comment of former MR 7.5. Comment [5] is derived from MR 7.5, Cmt. [1]. Comments [6] and [8] are derived from MR 7.5(b) and (c), respectively. Comment [7] is derived from MR 7.5, Cmt. [2]; they are similar in substance to former rule 1-400, Standard (7).

### *ABA Model Rule 7.2*

#### 2002 Model Rule Text:

The 1983 version of MR 7.2, titled “Advertising,” addressed a number of specific issues regarding communications directed to the general public.

MR 7.2(a) was permissive and provided that a lawyer “may” advertise the lawyer’s services through “written, recorded or electronic communication, including public media,” and described specific modes of advertising, e.g., newspaper, radio and television.

MR 7.2(b) required a lawyer to keep a copy or recording of an advertisement for two after its last dissemination.

MR 7.2(c) prohibited a lawyer from giving anything of value to a person not in the lawyer's firm who recommends the lawyer's services, subject to four exceptions.

MR 7.2(d) required that any advertisement must include the "name and office address" of a lawyer or law firm responsible for its content.

In 2002, many of the foregoing provisions were revised as part of the Ethics 2000 Commission's comprehensive revision of the Model Rules. For example, MR 7.2(a) deleted specific references to modes of public media and added "electronic" media as a permissive means of lawyer advertising.

Former MR 7.2(b), requiring a lawyer to keep records of advertisements for a period of two years after distribution or broadcast, was deleted.

Former MR 7.2(c) was designated MR 7.2(b) and its subsections revised. MR 7.2(b)(2) was amended to expand the permitted payments by a lawyer to include the usual charges of a legal service plan or a not-for-profit or qualified lawyer referral service "approved by an appropriate regulatory authority." MR 7.2(b)(4) was added to permit strategic alliances among lawyers, law firms and non-lawyers and their entities. MR 7.2(b)(4) permits non-exclusive reciprocal referring relationships subject to client disclosure.

1989 California Rules. Like the 1983 version of MR 7.2(b), former rule 1-400(F) required that copies of communications be retained for two years, while the Cal. B&P Code § 6159.1 requires retention of copies of advertisements for one year. Like MR 7.2(c), former rule 1-320 prohibited a lawyer from compensating any person for recommending or securing clients and also prohibited a lawyer from compensating a media source in return for publicity. Further, Standard (12) to former rule 1-400 created a presumption that a communication is misleading if it did not contain the name of at least one lawyer responsible for it. Cal. B&P Code § 6157.3 continues to require that where an advertisement made on behalf of a lawyer is paid for by someone other than the lawyer, the business relationship between the lawyer and that person must be disclosed.

Former rule 1-320(A)(4) was, and B&P Code §§ 6155 et seq. are, similar to MR 7.2(b)(2).

MR 7.2(b)(4) arguably was at variance with several provisions of the 1989 Rules. Reciprocal referrals from a non-lawyer businessperson or entity was prohibited if it involved in-person solicitation [former rule 1-400(B), (C)]; and also might have been prohibited as promising something of value (future referrals) in exchange for a referral [former rule 1-320(B)]. Neither of these foregoing rules turned on disclosure to or consent by the client. However, referral agreements and reciprocal referrals between lawyers and law firms were (and continue to be) permitted in California with disclosure and client consent [former rule 2-200(B)].

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.2 largely tracks the 2002 version of MR 7.2.

Cal. Rule 7.2(a) is nearly identical to MR 7.2(a) but adds the modifier "any" before "written" and the phrase "means of" after "electronic."

Cal. Rule 7.2(b), introductory clause, is similar to the corresponding clause of MR 7.2(b) but substitutes "compensate, promise or give anything of value" for "give anything of value," and adds "or securing" in addition to "recommending" and "law firm" in addition to "lawyer."

Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(1) and (3) are identical to the corresponding provisions in MR 7.2.

Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(2) substitutes "services" for "service," deletes "not-for-profit," as California law

permits for profit lawyer referral services, and conforms the definition of “qualified lawyer referral service” to California law.

Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(4) is nearly identical to MR 7.2(b)(4) but substitutes “arrangement” for “agreement” and adds a reference to the State Bar Act.

Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(5), regarding gratuities, has no counterpart in the 2002 version of MR 7.2. However, see “2018 Model Rule Text,” below. Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(5) carries forward the substance of former rules 1-320(B) and 2-200(B).

Cal. Rule 7.3(c) is identical to MR 7.2(c) except that it refers to “address,” not “office address,” presumably so that the inclusion of an email address would satisfy the rule.

2018 Model Rule Text:

MR 7.2 underwent substantial change in 2018 starting with its title, which is now “Communications Concerning a Lawyer’s Services: Specific Rules,” which better captures the fact that its scope is broader than the regulation of advertising. As revised, it addresses not only communications directed to the general public, i.e., advertisements (MR 7.2(a)), but also a lawyer’s compensation of others for recommending the lawyer’s services (MR 7.2(b)), and limitations on a lawyer asserting that the lawyer is a specialist in a particular field of practice (MR 7.2(c)).

MR 7.2(a) includes several changes. First, the paragraph is no longer “subject to” rules 7.1 and 7.3. Second, the clause “communicate information regarding the lawyer’s services” is substituted for “advertise.” Third, the phrase “any media” is substituted for the laundry list of permitted media in the 2002 version.

MR 7.2(b), introductory clause, now incorporates the Cal. Rule 7.2 phrase, “compensate, promise or give anything of value,” although in a slightly different order. It also eliminates the qualification in the 2002 version that the “person” is “not an employee or lawyer in the same law firm.” Unlike the California rule, however, it does not extend the rule’s scope to the “lawyer’s law firm.”

MR 7.2(b)(2) deletes the definition of “qualified lawyer referral service.” The definition now appears in MR 7.2, Cmt. [6].

MR 7.2(b)(5), regarding gratuities, is new. It is similar in substance to Cal. Rule 7.2(b)(5).

MR 7.2(c) did not previously appear in MR 7.2, but rather incorporates former MR 7.4(d) regarding claims of being a “certified” specialist. The corresponding 1989 and 2018 California provisions can be found in former rule 1-400(D)(6) and Cal. Rule 7.4(a), respectively.

MR 7.2(d) substitutes the term “contact information” for “office address” in the 2002 version of MR 7.2(c).

2002 Model Rule Comment:

The 2002 version of MR 7.2 included eight comments. In 2012, a number of amendments were made to the comments to MR 7.2. As noted in the discussion of the definition of “prospective client” under the Model Rule 1.18 comparison, references to “prospective client” were deleted or substituted in Comments [3], [6] and [7], and minor additions were made to Comments [1] through [3]. The most significant changes were made to Comment [5], which elaborates on permitted payments to third persons for generating client leads, including Internet-based client leads, as well as the limitations on such payments.

1989 California Rules. As noted, there was no Discussion section to former rule 1-400.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.2 includes four comments. Comments [1], [2], [3] and [4] are derived in part from MR 7.2, Cmts. [2], [4], [5] and [8], respectively.

2018 Model Rule Comment:

2018 MR 7.2 includes 12 comments. Former MR 7.2, Cmts. [1], [3] and [4] have been deleted. Former Comment [5], concerning payment for referrals, has been divided into three separate comments: [2], [3] and [5]. New Comment [4] clarifies the application of new MR 7.2(b)(5). Former Comments [6] to [8] remain largely unchanged. Comments [9] through [11] incorporate the substance of former MR 7.4, Cmts. [1] to [3]. Comment [12] defines “contact information” in revised MR 7.4(d) [former MR 7.4(c)]

### *ABA Model Rule 7.3*

2002 Model Rule Text:

The 2002 version of MR 7.3, titled “Solicitation of Clients,” addressed a lawyer’s communications directed to particular members of the public or a particular class of persons. The title of MR 7.3 had been changed in 2012 from “Direct Contact with Prospective Clients.” See discussion of the definition of “prospective client” under the Model Rule 1.18 comparison.

The 2002 version of MR 7.3(a) prohibited a lawyer from soliciting professional employment “by in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact,” the latter prohibition having been added in 2002 to address the advent of certain real-time modes of communication with the Internet, e.g., chat rooms. MR 7.3 provided two exceptions, i.e., if the person contacted (i) was a lawyer or (ii) had a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with the lawyer. In 2012, references to “prospective client” in MR 7.3(b)(1) and (c) were replaced by “target of the solicitation” and “anyone,” respectively.

MR 7.3(b) was not limited to real-time communications. In effect it provided that even when the communication was “written, recorded or electronic” (not just in real-time), the lawyer was prohibited from making contact if (i) the solicitation target had “made known” to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited or (ii) the solicitation involved “coercion, duress or harassment.”

MR 7.3(c) imposed certain notice requirements that had to accompany every “written, recorded or electronic” communication.

MR 7.3(d) was permissive and provided that a lawyer “may participate” with a prepaid or group legal service plan under the prescribed conditions.

1989 California Rules. Like MR 7.3, former rule 1-400(C) prohibited in-person and telephone solicitation of clients with whom the lawyer had no family or prior professional relationship. Former rule 1-400, however, did not address “real-time electronic” communications. The rule also expressly recognized that some solicitations are protected by the constitutions of both the United States and the State of California. The rule thus paid specific deference to the series of United States Supreme Court opinions on the issues of lawyer advertising and solicitation.

Former rule 4-100(B) defined contact subject to the solicitation prohibition as only -in-person or telephonic. But compare Cal. State Bar Formal Ethics Opn. 2004-166, concluding that a solicitation in a chat room, although not prohibited as an “in-person or telephonic” communication, was nevertheless prohibited if it involved intrusion or caused duress of the person being solicited. Former rule 4-100(C) exempted only prior professional and familial relationships.

Moreover, like former MR 7.3(c), Standard (5) to former rule 1-400 presumed a violation of the rule if an unsolicited mailed communication did not contain the words “Advertisement,”

“Newsletter” or the like, or did not conform to the detailed manner of setting forth such words.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.3 largely tracks the 2002 version of MR 7.3.

Cal. Rule 7.3(a) is identical to former MR 7.3(a) except for the deletion of the phrase “the lawyer’s” as a modifier of “doing so.”

Cal. Rule 7.3(b) is substantially similar to former MR 7.3(b) except: (i) the phrase “person being solicited” is substituted for “target of the solicitation,” and (ii) in subparagraph (b)(2), the phrase “is transmitted in any manner” and the term “intrusion” have been added. These substitutions and additions conform to the language in former rule 1-400(D)(5). See also discussion of MR 7.3(b) under “2018 Model Rule Text,” below.

Cal. Rule 7.3(c) is substantially similar to former MR 7.3(c) except: (i) any “person” (a defined term) is substituted for “anyone”; (ii) the phrase “the word ‘Advertisement’ or word of similar import” is substituted for “Advertising Material”; and (iii) the requirement is qualified by the following clause: “unless it is apparent from the context that the communication is an advertisement.”

Cal. Rule 7.3(d) is substantially similar to former MR 7.3(d) except that the word “live” is added to modify “telephone” and “real-time electronic contact” has been added to parallel the construction of paragraph (a).

Cal. Rule 7.3(e), a definition of “solicitation” and “solicit” has no counterpart in text of former MR 7.3. However, Cal. Rule 7.3(e) largely tracks the language of the definition in former MR 7.3, Cmt. [1].

2018 Model Rule Text:

Similar to MR 7.1 and 7.2, MR 7.3 underwent significant revision in 2018.

First, the definition of “solicitation” was moved from the Comment to paragraph (a) of the rule.

Second, MR 7.3(b) (former MR 7.3(a)) substitutes in the introductory clause the phrase “live person-to-person contact” for the former rule’s list of prohibited communication modes (“in-person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact”) and also adds that pecuniary gain can be a significant motive for the soliciting lawyer’s “law firm.” In addition, subparagraph (b)(2) adds as an exception a person who has a “business” relationship with the soliciting lawyer. Further, in addition to a relationship with the soliciting lawyer, subparagraph (b)(2) now excepts from the prohibition persons who have any of the listed relationships with the “law firm” of the soliciting lawyer.

Perhaps the most important change to MR 7.3 is the addition of subparagraph (b)(3), which excludes from the solicitation prohibition a “person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered by the lawyer.” If adopted by a jurisdiction, this provision would appear to put lawyers on equal footing with accountants with respect to “cold calling” potential clients. See *Edenfield v. Fane*, 507 U.S. 761 (1993). There is no counterpart to this exception in either former rule 1-400 or Cal. Rule 7.3.

MR 7.3(c) (former MR 7.3(b)) in its introductory paragraph deletes the list of communication modes (“by written, recorded or electronic communication or by in person, telephone or real-time electronic contact”) but otherwise is identical to former MR 7.3(b).

Former MR 7.3(c) regarding the inclusion of a notation of “Advertising Material” has been deleted.

New MR 7.3(d) excepts from the rule’s scope communications authorized by law or the order of a tribunal. There is no counterpart in either former rule 1-400 or Cal. Rule 7.3.



MR 7.3(e) is substantially the same as the 2002 version of MR 7.3(d).

2002 Model Rule Comment:

The 2002 version of MR 7.3 included nine comments. In 2012, a number of changes were made to the MR 7.3 comments. Most significantly, a new Comment [1], providing a definition of “solicitation,” was added and the remaining comments were renumbered. Under that added definition, a “solicitation” was a targeted communication “initiated by the lawyer that is directed to a specific person and that offers to provide, or can reasonably be understood as offering to provide, legal services.” Further, the term “prospective client” was replaced throughout the comments. See discussion of the definition of “prospective client” under the Model Rule 1.18 comparison. As noted, this definition has been moved into the text as MR 7.3(a).

1989 California Rules. Former rule 1-400 had no Discussion section. However, unlike former MR 7.3, which broadly defined “solicitation” in a comment, former rule 1-400(B) defined “solicitation” more narrowly, i.e., it had to be “delivered in person or by telephone” or “directed to a person known to the sender to be represented by counsel in a matter which is the subject of the communication.”

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.3 includes only four comments. Comment [1] is identical to the second sentence of former MR 7.3, Cmt. [1]. Comment [2] is derived from former MR 7.3, Cmt. [5], and provides examples of solicitations that would not involve pecuniary gain as a significant motive. Comment [3], derived from former MR 7.3, Cmt. [7], clarifies paragraph (d)’s exception for qualifying prepaid or group legal service plans. Comment [4] is derived from the last sentence of former MR 7.3, Cmt. [9].

2018 Model Rule Comment:

2018 MR 7.3 includes nine comments. Comment [1] restates paragraph (b) and carries forward the last sentence of former Comment [1]. Comment [2] elaborates on what is meant by “live person-to-person contact.” Importantly, it clarifies that the term does not include “chat rooms, text messages or other written communications that recipients may easily disregard.”

Comments [3] and [4] are substantially similar to the 2002 versions. Comment [5], which explains the rationale for the exceptions to paragraph (b)’s prohibition on “live person-to-person contact,” has added several examples of the new exception in MR 7.3(b)(3) for a “person who routinely uses for business purposes the type of legal services offered by the lawyer.”

Comment [6] adds examples of persons who might be particularly susceptible to overreaching. Comments [7] and [9] are nearly identical to the 2002 versions. New comment [8], which explains new paragraph (d) concerning orders of a tribunal, replaces former comment [8], which explained deleted former 7.3(c) concerning the “Advertising Material” notice.

*ABA Model Rule 7.4*

Note re Model Rules 7.4 and 7.5.

Although the ABA recently deleted MR 7.4 and 7.5 as standalone rules, moving the substance of the rules into MR 7.2 and 7.1, respectively, we include descriptions of the rules here because the 2018 California Rules — and as of this writing, the rules of nearly every other jurisdiction — include standalone rule counterparts to both rules.

2002 Model Rule Text:

The 2002 version of MR 7.4 addressed a lawyer’s communication of fields of practice. Former MR 7.4(a) provided a lawyer “may” disavow practicing in certain fields, and paragraphs (b) and

(c) permitted lawyers to state they engaged in patent or admiralty practice, respectively. Paragraph (d) regulated communications regarding certifications to practice.

1989 California Rules. Although former rule 1-400 did not address communication of fields of practice specifically, Cal. B&P Code § 6158.2 presumes that such a communication is acceptable, so long as the communication as a whole is not false, misleading or deceptive. Regarding MR 7.4(d) on certifications, former rule 1-400(D)(6) was substantially similar.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.4(a) is substantially similar to former MR 7.4(d) [now MR 7.2(c)] regarding communications about certifications.

Cal. Rule 7.4(b), first sentence, is substantially similar to former MR 7.4(a). Cal. Rule 7.4(b) adds that lawyers may also state they specialize in, are limited to, or are concentrated in a particular field of law.

2018 Model Rule Text:

As noted, former MR 7.4 has been removed as a standalone rule, its substance being moved to MR 7.2. The following table shows the location of former MR 7.4 provisions in the 2018 Model Rules:

Comparison of Former Model Rule 7.4 and New Model Rule 7.2 (2018)	
Former Model Rule 7.4	Model Rule 7.2 (2018)
Former MR 7.4(d)	MR 7.2(c)
Former MR 7.4, Cmt. [1]	MR 7.2, Cmt. [9]
Former MR 7.4, Cmt. [2]	MR 7.2, Cmt. [10]
Former MR 7.4, Cmt. [3]	MR 7.2, Cmt. [11]

2002 Model Rule Comment:

MR 7.4 included three comments, the substance of which have been moved to the comments of MR 7.2. See Table, above.

1989 California Rules. As noted, there was no Discussion section to former rule 1-400.

2018 California Rules. Similarly, Cal. Rule 7.4 has no comments.

#### *ABA Model Rule 7.5*

2002 Model Rule Text:

The 2002 version of MR 7.5 addressed the potentially misleading use of firm names and letterheads. MR 7.5(a) prohibited use of a firm name, letterhead of “other professional designation” that was false or misleading, but stated trade names were permitted if they complied with former MR 7.1. MR 7.5(b) addressed permitted designations of law firms with offices in more than one jurisdiction. MR 7.5(c) placed limits on using in a firm name the name of a lawyer holding public office, and MR 7.5(d) provided lawyers may claim to practice in a partnership only

if true. The substance of former MR 7.5 has been moved to the comment section of MR 7.1.

1989 California Rules. Former rule 1-400 did not include any text provisions similar to MR 7.5(a) through (d). However, several standards to former rule 1-400 created the presumption that a communication is misleading due to its reference to a firm name, trade name or fictitious name. These restrictions include stating or implying: 1) a relationship between a lawyer and a government agency or legal services organization; and 2) that a lawyer had a relationship to any other lawyer or law firm unless that relationship in fact existed. See Standards (6) through (9).

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.5(a) is substantively similar to the first sentence of former MR 7.5(a). Paragraph (b) is substantively similar to the second sentence of former MR 7.5(a), and paragraph (c) is substantively similar to former MR 7.5(d).

2018 Model Rule Text:

As noted, former MR 7.5 has been removed as a standalone rule, its substance having been moved to MR 7.1. The following table shows the location of former MR 7.5 provisions in the 2018 Model Rules:

Comparison of Former Model Rule 7.5 and New Model Rule 7.1 (2018)	
Former Model Rule 7.4	Model Rule 7.2 (2018)
Former MR 7.5, Cmt. [1]	MR 7.1, Cmt. [5]
Former MR 7.5(b)	MR 7.1, Cmt. [6]
Former MR 7.5(d) & Cmt. [2]	MR 7.1, Cmt. [7]
Former MR 7.5(c)	MR 7.1, Cmt. [8]

2002 Model Rule Comment:

MR 7.5 included two comments. The substance of comment [1] and [2] have been moved to MR 7.1, Cmts. [5] and [7], respectively.

1989 California Rules. As noted, there was no Discussion section to former rule 1-400.

2018 California Rules. Cal. Rule 7.5 has a single comment which clarifies that “other professional designation” includes “logos, letterheads, URLs, and signature blocks.”