

## Commission for Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct

The following are the two best State Bar website resources for reviewing the draft Rules. (The direct URL and a bread-crum path starting at the Bar's homepage are provided.)

(1) [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) > "Ethics" > "Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct" > "Draft Rules"

[http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar\\_generic.jsp?cid=10129&id=7682](http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar_generic.jsp?cid=10129&id=7682)

The "Draft Rules" page provides links to the following PDF documents:

- Proposed New and Amended Rules of Professional Conduct - Batch 4 and Batch 1-3 Rules Referred to the Commission for Further Consideration, Adopted by the Board of Governors on January 9, 2010
- Proposed New and Amended Rules of Professional Conduct - Batches 1, 2 & 3 as Adopted by the Board of Governors on November 14, 2009
- Public Comment Versions of Rules Distributed in 2006 (Batch 1)
- Public Comment Versions of Rules Distributed in 2007 (Batch 2)
- Public Comment Versions of Rules Distributed in 2008 (Batch 3)
- Public Comment Versions of Rules Distributed in 2009 (Batch 4)
- Public Comment Versions of Rules Distributed in 2009 (Batch 5)

(2) [www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov) > "Public Comment" > "Discussion Draft (January 2010) – Proposed"

[http://calbar.ca.gov/calbar/pdfs/public-comment/2009/Revision-Rules-Professional-Conduct-12-Rules\\_01-11-10.pdf](http://calbar.ca.gov/calbar/pdfs/public-comment/2009/Revision-Rules-Professional-Conduct-12-Rules_01-11-10.pdf)

This "Public Comment" page is the Commission's Discussion Draft requesting public comment on the Batch 6 rules. The public comment deadline is March 12, 2010.

The State Bar's game plan for completing the Board's adoption of all of the Commission's proposed rules is reflected in the schedule of relevant Board of Governor meetings and the planned deliverables.

### **LIST OF RELEVANT 2010 BOARD MEETINGS & ANTICIPATED BOARD ACTION**

**Batch 6** issued for a 60-day public comment = Jan. 7, 2010

**Batch 4** considered for adoption after conclusion of public comment = Jan. 7-9, 2010

**Batch 5** considered for adoption after conclusion of public comment = March 4-6, 2010

**Batch 6** considered for adoption after conclusion of public comment = May 13-15, 2010  
(Comment Deadline: 3/12/10)

**Final Report** issued for a 45-day public comment = May 13-15, 2010 (if no Board revisions to Batch 6 as submitted by the Commission) or July 23-25, 2010 (if there are Board revisions to Batch 6)

**Final Report** considered for adoption after conclusion of public comment = July 23-25, 2010 (if no revisions to Final Report and the Final Report was issued for public comment in May) or Sept. 24, 2010 (if there are revisions to the Final Report or if the Final Report was issued in July rather than May)

62404454 v1

Printed from The State Bar of California website ([www.calbar.ca.gov](http://www.calbar.ca.gov)) on Thursday, January 14, 2010

Location:

---

## Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct

### COMMISSION CHARTER

The Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct ("Commission") is to evaluate the existing California Rules of Professional Conduct ("California Rules") in their entirety, considering developments in the attorney professional responsibility field since the last comprehensive revision of the California Rules occurred in 1989 and 1992.

• Twelve Proposed New or Amended Rules Circulating for Public Comment Deadline: March 12, 2010

In this regard, the Commission is to consider, along with judicial and statutory developments, the Final Report and Recommendations of the American Bar Association's ("ABA") Ethics 2000 Commission and the American Law Institute's Restatement of the Law Third, The Law Governing Lawyers ("Restatement"), as well as other authorities relevant to the development of professional responsibility standards.

The Commission is specifically charged to also consider the work that has occurred at the local, state and national level with respect to Multi-Disciplinary Practice ("MDP"), Multi-Jurisdictional Practice ("MJP"), unauthorized practice of law ("UPL"), court facilitated propria persona assistance, discrete task representation and to other subjects that have a substantial impact upon the development of professional responsibility standards.

The Commission is to develop proposed amendments to the California Rules that:

1. Facilitate compliance with and enforcement of the rules by eliminating ambiguities and uncertainties in the rules;
2. Assure adequate protection to the public in light of developments that have occurred since the rules were last reviewed and amended in 1989 and 1992;
3. Promote confidence in the legal profession and the administration of justice; and
4. Eliminate and avoid unnecessary differences between California and other states, fostering the evolution of a national standard with respect to professional responsibility issues.

© 2010 The State Bar of California



# LAWYERS' MANUAL ON PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

VOL. 25, NO. 24 651-655

CURRENT REPORTS

NOVEMBER 25, 2009

## Model Rules

### California Bar Approves First Set Of Updates to Professional Conduct Rules

**T**he California State Bar's board of governors Nov. 14 gave its stamp of approval to nearly three dozen new or amended professional conduct rules, in a key step on the road toward updating the state's standards governing lawyers' behavior.

The proposed rules and accompanying comments were part of the first group of recommendations presented to the board of governors for its consideration, with other batches to be considered seriatim in coming months. None of the rules will go into effect, however, unless and until they are approved by the California Supreme Court.

The board declined to approve a few of the first set of proposals, however, including measures dealing with advance waivers of conflicts, and sexual relationships between attorney and client.

In what will be a major change for California lawyers, the new rules follow the numbering of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, except that the specific conflicts rules lumped together in Model Rule 1.8 are assigned separate numbers in the California proposals.

In comments to BNA, Western State University law professor Kevin E. Mohr expressed enthusiasm about California's shift to the Model Rules format. "It gives California a seat at the national ethics table," he said. Mohr serves as consultant to the state bar rules revision commission, which was charged with updating California's professional conduct rules.

The 35 rules the bar approved follow some parts of the corresponding ABA models with little change, such as the ABA rules on lawyers' serving as third-party neutrals (Model Rule 2.4), meritorious claims and contentions (Model Rule 3.1), supervisory duties within private firms (Model Rules 5.1 through 5.3), and most of the ABA provisions that govern marketing of lawyers' services (Model Rules 7.1 through 7.5).

On the other hand, the board accepted the commission's recommendation to retain numerous unique California rules, either as standalone rules or provisions woven into the framework of the ABA models. "When you come right down to it, many of the standards are the same" as the current California rules, Mohr said.

Only a few of the newly approved rules, such as Rule 5.6 (restrictions on a lawyer's right to practice) and

Rule 7.5 (firm names and letterheads), adopt the corresponding ABA standard in its entirety. Most of the new rules carry forward some content from California's existing rules, along with language or concepts from the ABA model and entirely new wording.

**Project Now on Fast Track.** The rules endorsed by the board of governors were formulated by the bar's Special Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct, which was asked to evaluate California's existing professional conduct rules in light of developments occurring since the last major updates to the California rules in 1989 and 1992.

The project has been underway for eight years but was recently put on a fast-track schedule at the request of the state bar leadership. The rapid timetable envisions a complete set of rules being put out for public comment in late spring or early summer of 2010, according to Mohr.

To expedite the process and make it more manageable, the board is taking up the commission's proposals in batches rather than waiting to review the recommendations as a whole at the end of the commission's work.

The commission developed five sets of proposals that have been published for comment over the past four years. A sixth and final set is expected to be published for comment early next year. "We have changed any number of rules in response to comments," Mohr said.

The first set of recommended standards submitted to the board included rules from the first three groups of proposals that the commission issued for public comment. The board approved 35 of the 39 recommended rules.

---

**Shifting to the Model Rules numbering system  
"gives California a seat at the national ethics  
table."**

PROFESSOR KEVIN E. MOHR

---

The governors also accepted the commission's recommendation not to adopt Model Rule 3.2 (expediting litigation). According to Mohr, the commission determined that the subject the model rule addresses is better handled in the courts rather than the disciplinary system.

In adopting most of the first bunch of rules, the board reserved the option to take a last look and make revisions after the entire body of proposed rules is aired for public comment. Afterwards, the package will be sent to the California Supreme Court for possible approval.

**Fees.** With regard to attorneys' fees, new Rule 1.5 departs substantially from its ABA counterpart. For example, while Model Rule 1.5 states a prohibition against an "unreasonable" fee, the new California rule continues the state's standard prohibiting an "unconscionable" or illegal fee.

Rule 1.5 features a new standard on nonrefundable fees, which makes exceptions for a "true retainer" and flat fees in certain circumstances. (See box.) These new provisions were adapted from the lawyer conduct rules in Washington state, Mohr said.

Mohr pointed out that even when flat fees are permitted, they still must be earned. Comment [11] to Rule 1.5 states that when a lawyer-client relationship terminates, the lawyer must refund the unearned portion of a fee, and Rule 1.16(e)(2) requires that when a representation terminates for any reason, the lawyer must refund any part of a fee paid in advance that the lawyer has not yet earned, other than a true retainer fee.

Other parts of Rule 1.5 that would be new for California lawyers include a prohibition against charging "an unconscionable or illegal in-house expense," and a provision codifying case law against contingent fee arrangements in criminal defense and certain family law matters.

Rule 1.5 does not include the ABA model's provisions that address communicating fee arrangements to clients and requirements for contingent fee arrangements (Model Rule 1.5(b) and (c)). Those topics are addressed by statute in California, as the comment to the rule points out.

Rule 1.5 does not address fee-sharing among lawyers who are not in the same firm; instead, the subject is covered in a separate standard, Rule 1.5.1. That rule retains California's existing approach, which does not require a referring lawyer to do any work or share responsibility in the referred matter in order to be paid a portion of the fee.

The rule on fee-splitting contains new procedural requirements, however, for dividing fees. Additional requirements are set out for obtaining and documenting informed client consent, and the agreement between the lawyers must also be in writing.

**Ex Parte Contacts.** Rule 4.2, which addresses communications with those who already have counsel in a matter, follows the ABA approach of regulating communications with a represented "person" rather than a represented "party."

Mohr said that the proposed shift to this standard proved to be controversial, with prosecutors and public defenders arguing that it would interfere with their ability to interview witnesses. The current rule has been interpreted not to cover interviews with witnesses who are not parties. *In re Dale*, 2005 WL 1389226, 21 Law. Man. Prof. Conduct 281 (Cal. Bar Ct. Review Dep't 2005).

Rule 4.2, which includes much more detail than the ABA model, carries forward some provisions of the current California rule, such as standards, slightly modified, on communicating with officers and employees of a represented organization. The rule forbids corporate

counsel from asserting blanket representation of all employees unless that statement is true. Moreover, it prohibits a lawyer, when engaging in contacts permitted by the rule, from pretending to be disinterested or trying to obtain privileged or confidential information that the lawyer is not entitled to receive.

Rule 4.3, which regulates a lawyer's dealings with unrepresented persons, is largely similar to the ABA model. Like Rule 4.2, it prohibits a lawyer from trying to obtain privileged or confidential information that the lawyer is not supposed to acquire.

**Competence.** The board accepted the commission's recommendation to retain California's current standard on the subject of competence, which forbids a lawyer to "intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly" fail to provide legal services with competence.

In Mohr's view, this aspect of California's rules is one of the ways in which the new rules vary most greatly from the ABA's patterns. Model Rule 1.1 flatly requires a lawyer to provide competent representation.

The commission concluded, consistent with California's current rule, that lawyers should be disciplined only for repeated acts of incompetence rather than a single negligent lapse, Mohr said.

**MJP.** With respect to multijurisdictional practice, Rule 5.5 forbids a lawyer who is not admitted in California to establish a resident office or other systematic or continuous presence in California, except as authorized by the professional conduct rules or other law. Furthermore, a lawyer not admitted in California is forbidden by the rule to hold out to the public that the lawyer is admitted in California.

When proposed Rule 5.5 was released for public comment, the commission explained that it could not recommend Model Rule 5.5 in its entirety because California has largely addressed MJP issues through revisions to the California Rules of Court.

The comment to Rule 5.5 cross-references separate rules that authorize practice by out-of-state lawyers in various circumstances, such as California Rules of Court 9.47 (attorneys practicing law temporarily in California as part of litigation) and 9.48 (nonlitigating attorneys temporarily in California to provide legal services).

**Organization as Client.** In one of the most notable departures from the ABA's rules, Rule 1.13 omits the provision in Model Rule 1.13 that in some circumstances allows corporate counsel to act as a whistleblower to report wrongdoing outside the organization. Far from allowing outside disclosure in some circumstances, Rule 1.13(c) declares that when responding to a constituent's malfeasance under paragraph (b), lawyers shall not violate the statutory duty of confidentiality owed to the client organization.

On the other hand, Rule 1.13 embraces the model provision recognizing a professional obligation in some situations to report misconduct up the ladder to higher authority within the corporate client. In that regard, the California rule goes beyond the ABA model by imposing an objective standard that requires action when the lawyer knows or "reasonably should know" of a violation likely to cause substantial injury.

**Marketing Rules.** On the subject of lawyer advertising and solicitation, Rules 7.1 through 7.5 depart from their counterparts in the ABA model to a much lesser extent than the standards prevailing in most other states. Mohr explained that with the advent of the internet as a medium for lawyer advertising, the commission concluded that it was important to have some uniformity between the advertising rules inside and outside California. "Other jurisdictions apparently don't think so," he remarked, referring to the substantial variation among state rules on marketing legal services.

Rule 7.1 (communications concerning availability of legal services) bars a "false or misleading communication," which is defined to include not only untruths, material misrepresentations, and factual omissions that are needed to avoid being misleading, but also any material or format that is confusing, deceptive, or misleading. The rule contains a broad definition of what communications are covered by the rules.

At present, California lawyers must follow 16 specific standards on lawyer marketing that have been adopted by the state bar. Six of them are carried forward as standards approved by the bar, including standards that make it presumptively unethical for a lawyer to guarantee results, use testimonials or endorsements without a disclaimer, or include dramatizations without a notice that the advertisement is a dramatization. Those six standards are set out following the comment to Rule 7.1. The remaining standards were moved into other rules or deleted.

Rule 7.2 authorizes reciprocal referral arrangements with "another lawyer or non-lawyer" so long as the arrangement is nonexclusive and the client is notified. The corresponding provision in the ABA model allows these arrangements with another lawyer or a "nonlawyer professional."

Tracking a similar change in the ABA model, Rule 7.2 omits California's current archiving requirement, which calls for copies of advertisements to be retained for two years. Like the ABA model, Rule 7.2 requires advertisements to include the name and office address of at least one lawyer or law firm responsible for its content.

Also like the ABA model, Rule 7.3 prohibits a lawyer from soliciting professional employment from most

prospective clients by "in person, live telephone or real-time electronic contact" when a significant motive for doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain. The California rule expressly excepts communications that are constitutionally protected.

**Misconduct.** Rule 8.4 departs from the ABA model in several key respects. For example, it prohibits not only criminal acts that reflect adversely on a lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness, but also those that involve moral turpitude.

In addition, Rule 8.4 does not specifically ban attempts to violate professional conduct rules; instead, it carries forward current California language that forbids lawyers to "knowingly assist in, solicit, or induce" violations of the rules or the State Bar Act.

The prohibition in Rule 8.4 against conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice differs from the ABA model in that it applies only to conduct in connection with the practice of law, but expressly covers lawyers' conduct in representing themselves.

Rule 8.1 prohibits knowingly false statements of material facts and material factual omissions in an individual's own application for admission to practice law, as well as knowingly false factual statements in connection with another person's application for admission. The rule defines "admission" broadly to reach readmission, reinstatement to active membership, and request for admission *pro hac vice*.

**Purpose and Scope of Rules.** The commission chose not to recommend the Preamble and Scope sections found in the Model Rules; instead, Rule 1.0 (which in the Model Rules provides definitions) addresses the purpose and scope of the rules.

Like current state rules, Rule 1.0 makes clear that lawyers are subject to discipline for "willful" violation of the rules.

Rule 1.0(b)(1) declares that the rules are binding on all members of the state bar and "all other lawyers practicing law in this state."

Rule 1.0(b)(3) provides: "Nothing in these Rules or the comments to the Rules is intended to enlarge or to restrict the law regarding the liability of lawyers to others."

### California Bar Approves Rule Regulating Nonrefundable and Flat Fees

*California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.5, which has been approved by the state bar but not yet by the state supreme court, features this provision on nonrefundable fees:*

"(e) A lawyer shall not make an agreement for, charge, or collect a nonrefundable fee, except:

"(1) a lawyer may charge a true retainer, which is a fee that a client pays to a lawyer to ensure the lawyer's availability to the client during a specified period or on a specified matter, in addition to

and apart from any compensation for legal services performed. A true retainer must be agreed to in a writing signed by the client. Unless otherwise agreed, a true retainer is the lawyer's property on receipt.

"(2) a lawyer may charge a flat fee for specified legal services, which constitutes complete payment for those services and may be paid in whole or in part in advance of the lawyer providing the services. If agreed to in advance in a writing signed by the client, a flat fee is the lawyer's property on

receipt. The written fee agreement shall, in a manner that can easily be understood by the client, include the following: (i) the scope of the services to be provided; (ii) the total amount of the fee and the terms of payment; (iii) that the fee is the lawyer's property immediately on receipt; (iv) that the fee agreement does not alter the client's right to terminate the client-lawyer relationship; and (v) that the client may be entitled to a refund of a portion of the fee if the agreed-upon legal services have not been completed."

**Specific Conflicts Rules.** The new rules include specific standards on gifts from clients (Rule 1.8.3), payment of expenses for clients (Rule 1.8.5), and limiting liability to a client (Rule 1.8.8).

Like the current California rule on payment of a client's personal or business expenses, Rule 1.8.5 grants more leeway than the ABA model to provide financial assistance to clients. For example, the rule allows loans to a client if they are made after the lawyer's hiring, the client promises in writing to repay the money, and the requirements of the rule on lawyer-client business transactions are satisfied.

As in existing state rules, paragraph (a) of Rule 1.8.8 flatly forbids a lawyer to make a contract with a client that prospectively limits the lawyer's liability for malpractice. It omits the exception in Model Rule 1.8(h)(1) for situations in which the client has independent counsel.

Like Model Rule 1.8(b), paragraph (b) of Rule 1.8.8 forbids a lawyer to settle a claim or potential claim for malpractice with a client or former client unless the client is advised in writing to seek an independent lawyer and given a reasonable opportunity to do so. The California rule also makes an exception where a client is actually represented by independent counsel concerning the settlement.

**Model Rules Embraced With Little Change.** Rule 2.4, which addresses a lawyer's role as a third-party neutral, follows the ABA model with only minor changes. The rule requires a lawyer serving in this role to inform unrepresented parties that the lawyer is not representing them. It also requires a lawyer acting as a third-party neutral to explain how that role differs from a lawyer's role as a client representative if the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the unrepresented person does not understand the difference.

Mohr said that the commission received lots of public comment about whether the rule on third-party neutrals should incorporate other California standards already in place for some mediators and arbitrators. Ultimately the commission decided to endorse the ABA model.

The rules on supervision within law firms (Rules 5.1-5.3) closely follow the ABA models. For example, Rule 5.1 requires law firm partners, and lawyers who possess comparable managerial authority, to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm comply with the professional conduct rules and the State Bar Act.

Mohr told BNA that although these rules on supervision within firms do not change California law, some commentators expressed concern that the proposed standards are too vague and could result in vicarious liability. The commission decided, however, that the rules were helpful and did not create vicarious liability, Mohr said.

Rule 5.6, which addresses restrictions on a lawyer's right to practice, follows the ABA model, although the commission originally floated a quite different rule. The comment to the rule acknowledges that California case law allows firms to impose a reasonable cost on departing partners who compete with the firm in a limited geographical area.

**Other Rules Adopted.** Rule 1.4, on communication with clients, differs in some respects from the ABA template. For example, it imposes a duty on lawyers to

comply with reasonable client requests for access to significant documents. The duty can be discharged either by permitting a client to inspect the documents in the lawyer's possession or by providing copies to the client.

In another departure from Model Rule 1.4, the California rule retains the current requirement that lawyers notify clients of settlement offers.

Also adopted in this set of recommendations were standards on declining or terminating representation (Rule 1.16), fairness to opposing party and counsel (Rule 3.4), impartiality and decorum of the tribunal (Rule 3.5), and interference with a lawyer's professional independence (Rule 5.4).

In general, these rules follow the format of their Model Rule counterparts but include unique California provisions, which for the most part are retained from current professional conduct rules.

**Unique Rules Carried Forward.** A half-dozen new rules have no counterparts in the ABA standards and instead are based on unique provisions in the current California professional conduct rules. These six rules address the following subjects:

- lawyers serving as temporary judge, referee, or court-appointed arbitrator (Rule 2.4.1);
- threatening criminal, administrative, or disciplinary charges (Rule 3.10);
- employment of disbarred, suspended, resigned, or involuntarily inactive lawyers (Rule 5.3.1);
- compliance with conditions of discipline and agreements in lieu of discipline (Rule 8.1.1);
- prohibited discrimination in law practice management and operation (Rule 8.4.1); and
- purchasing property at a foreclosure sale (Rule 1.8.12).

**Four Proposals Nixed or Tabled.** In its review of the first bunch of recommended rules, the board of governors did not adopt the commission's proposed standards on current-client conflicts (Rule 1.7), lawyer-client business transactions (Rule 1.8.1), sexual relations with clients (Rule 1.8.10), and reporting misconduct (Rule 8.3).

Although most other states have not departed substantially from Model Rule 1.7 when revising their ethics codes in light of the 2002 amendments to the Model Rules, the commission proposed a version of Rule 1.7 substantially different from the ABA model in terms of the approach and language used to regulate conflicting interests that involve current clients. For the most part, the recommended Rule 1.7 collected existing California conflicts rules, such as specific standards that regulate multiple representation, specify the kinds of interests and relationships that could give rise to a lawyer's personal conflict, and require informed written consent to conflicts among current clients.

During the board's consideration of the recommended rule, concerns were raised about both the substance of the rule and language in the comment concerning advance conflict waivers. Although the proposed California comment on advance waivers aimed to be more client-protective than the corresponding comment in Model Rule 1.7, some members of the board of governors were still uncomfortable with the idea of allowing waivers when full disclosure cannot yet be made, Mohr told BNA. The board returned the rule to the commission for further study.

Also returned to the commission for another look was the proposed rule on sex with clients. The proposal substantially followed Model Rule 1.8(j), which prohibits a lawyer from having sexual relations with a client unless a consensual sexual relationship began before the lawyer-client relationship. The commission originally circulated for public comment a rule that closely followed current California Rule 3-120 in that it limited, but did not ban, virtually all sexual relationships. After receiving public comment on the proposal, the commission voted to follow the ABA's approach.

According to Mohr, the board of governors did not appear to oppose the decision to use the ABA's approach, but instead questioned the definition of "sexual relations," which was imported verbatim from Rule 3-120, in the proposed rule.

With regard to the rule on lawyer-client business transactions, Mohr said that discussion within the board of governors centered on the issue of applying the rule to modifications of existing fee agreements. The bar's Office of Chief Trial Counsel takes the position that modification of a fee agreement is always a business transaction, whereas the proposed comments to Rule 1.8.1 do not take that hard-and-fast approach, he explained. The board did not vote on the proposed business transactions rule; instead, the proposal was tabled. The commission will consider whether the comments should be revised, Mohr said.

Also tabled was proposed Rule 8.3 (reporting misconduct), because the board simply did not have time to get to it. At present, California has no rule that requires lawyers to report misconduct.

**What's Ahead.** Current plans for the project to revise the rules call for a second set of recommended rules to be submitted to the board of governors for its consideration in January. This batch, to be drawn mostly from the commission's fourth group of proposed rules, is expected to include rules on candor toward tribunals, safekeeping property, aggregate settlements, and trial publicity.

A third group of recommended rules, drawn from the commission's fifth group of proposals, will be sent to the board of governors as early as March. This batch is expected to include rules on lawyer-client confidentiality, special responsibilities of prosecutors, representing clients with diminished capacity, disciplinary authority and choice of law, former-client conflicts, and imputation of conflicts. No provision for screening was included in the version of Rule 1.10 (imputation of conflicts) that was floated for public comment; however, the comment period has just recently ended and the commission has not yet reviewed the comments, Mohr noted.

A fourth and final set of revisions to be recommended for the board's consideration will be based on the upcoming sixth group of proposals. After the board has considered all of the recommended rules, the entire group of rules it approves will be reissued en masse for a final public comment period before being sent to the California Supreme Court for possible approval.

BY JOAN C. ROGERS

*The California State Bar's news release announcing the board's adoption of the first batch of rules is posted at [http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar\\_generic.jsp?cid=10144&n=96901](http://calbar.ca.gov/state/calbar/calbar_generic.jsp?cid=10144&n=96901).*