MEMORANDUM

To: MSBA Rules of Professional Conduct Committee

From: Eric Cooperstein, on behalf of Rule 5.5 Subcommittee

Date: May 21, 2017

Re: **Amendments to Rule 5.5, Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct (MRPC)**

This memo, updated after initial discussions at the March 28 and April 25, 2017 MSBA Rules of Professional Conduct Committee meetings, details three subcommittee proposals to amend Rule 5.5, all of which were approved by the RPC committee at its April 25, 2017 meeting. As an overview:

- The amendment to Rule 5.5(c)(4) is intended to respond directly to the Court's invitation in *In re Panel File 39302,* 884 N.W.2d 661 (Minn. 2016) to amend and expand that rule to better reflect the bar's understanding of the meaning of fields of practice that are "reasonably related" to a lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed.
- Proposed new section 5.5(e) is intended to remove certain client relationships from the purview of Rule 5.5 –including current and former clients, family members, close friends, and other professional relationships-- to both reflect the common current practices of lawyers and allow client selection of lawyers and client trust to take priority over the geographic restrictions that may otherwise be imposed by Rule 5.5.
- The proposed amendments to Rule 5.5(b) and (d) are intended to allow lawyers to continue to practice the law of the jurisdictions in which they are licensed when they relocate to Minnesota. This proposal follows recent similar amendments in Arizona and New Hampshire.

Each of the suggested amendments is explained below, followed by a full text, redline version of the Rule. The amendments are all offered in the context of trying to ensure that Rule 5.5 is not interpreted to proscribe conduct that would otherwise be thought of by the practicing bar as "what good lawyers do."

I. Background.

In August, the Minnesota Supreme Court decided a private admonition appeal, *In re Panel File 39302,* 884 N.W.2d 661 (Minn. 2016). The case concerned a Colorado lawyer, not admitted in Minnesota, who was contacted by his mother and father-in-law regarding efforts to collect a judgment from them. The in-laws were Minnesota

residents and the opposing party, the underlying lawsuit, and the opposing party's counsel were all in Minnesota.

The Colorado lawyer agreed to help his in-laws negotiate a resolution. The Colorado lawyer, from his office in Colorado, exchanged about two dozen e-mails with the opposing party's Minnesota lawyer over a three-month period. The Minnesota lawyer became frustrated with the process and filed an ethics complaint against him with the Minnesota Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility (OLPR). OLPR issued the lawyer a private admonition for violating Rule 5.5 by practicing law in Minnesota. The Colorado lawyer appealed to a three-person panel of the Lawyers Professional Responsibility Board (LPRB). After a hearing, the Panel affirmed the admonition, focusing predominately on the location of the parties to the matter. I represented the Colorado lawyer in an appeal to the Minnesota Supreme Court.

Two primary issues were presented to the Court: 1) whether a lawyer practices "in" a jurisdiction by sending e-mails to a lawyer in that jurisdiction and 2) whether the Colorado lawyer's conduct was permitted under the "temporary practice" provision of Rule 5.5(c)(4), which allows a lawyer to practice temporarily in a jurisdiction if the legal services provided "arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice."

The Court ruled, 4-3, that the Colorado lawyer had engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in Minnesota. The Court stated that a lawyer could practice in a jurisdiction solely by sending e-mail communications to someone in that jurisdiction. The Court relied heavily on dicta in a 1998 California decision, *In re Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank, P.C. v. Superior Court,* 949 P.2d 1 (Cal. 1998), a fee dispute in which both physical and virtual presence in California were at issue. Ironically, *Birbrower* inspired significant changes to Rule 5.5 of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, which changes were mostly adopted in Minnesota in 2005.

The Court also ruled that the Colorado lawyer's conduct was not permitted by Rule 5.5(c)(4) because although the lawyer did some collections work, that work was not part of a "particular body of federal, nationally-uniform, foreign, or international law. *See* Rule 5.5, cmt. 14. Hence, the Court determined that the representation of his in-laws was not "reasonably related" to his practice in Colorado. The Court stated in a footnote, however, that "If there are concerns that these [Rule 5.5(c)] exceptions do not adequately meet client needs, the better way to address such concerns would be through filing a petition to amend Rule 5.5(c)."

II. Rationale for Seeking Amendments to Rule 5.5.

Rule 5.5, which mostly follows the ABA Model Rule, presently enforces geographic restrictions on the practice of law. In the years since the present version of the rule was adopted in 2005, lawyers and clients have become increasingly mobile. Both lawyers' practices and their clients' legal matters routinely cross state lines. *Panel File 39302* highlights some of the unintended consequences of the present rule and draws

attention to how confusing it may be for lawyers to determine whether their conduct runs afoul of the rule.

For example, although the Minnesota Supreme Court has broadly defined when a lawyer may be practicing "in" a jurisdiction under Rule 5.5(a), the provisions of 5.5(c) are intended to allow a lawyer to practice "on a temporary basis" in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed. The present rule leaves several questions unanswered:

- A MN lawyer represents a MN corporate client for many years. The client moves its main operations to another state where the lawyer is not licensed. Rule 5.5(c)(4) allows the lawyer to continue to represent the client, including meeting with the client in the other state, conducting transactions for and advising client, communicating with the client by phone and e-mail, etc. The legal work is essentially the same work that the lawyer performed while the client was in MN. However, the exception in 5.5(c)(4) applies only on a temporary basis. May the lawyer continue representing the lawyer indefinitely? If not, how long will the "temporary exception" apply? What interest would be protected by forcing the lawyer to cease representing the client?

- A MN lawyer with an office in MN purchases a home outside MN, such as in Hudson, Wisconsin or Fargo, North Dakota. The lawyer finds that he or she is more productive working from home on occasion. Working at home on a temporary basis would be permitted by Rule 5.5(c)(4). How many days a week may a lawyer work from home and still fall within rule 5.5(c)(4), rather than the prohibition in Rule 5.5(b) on establishing a "systematic and continuous presence" in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed? A similar problem confronts lawyers who want to spend winters in other jurisdictions but continue working remotely during their time away.

- A MN lawyer represents several long-time MN clients in a variety of matters. The lawyer's spouse obtains a "dream job" in another jurisdiction. The lawyer could easily continue all of the work for the MN clients from outside the state, except for the prohibition in Rule 5.5(b) on establishing a "systematic and continuous presence" in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed.

Note that for each of these examples, the issue could be presented in the opposite way, i.e. when a lawyer licensed in another state encounters one of these situations. The proposed amendments below would protect non-Minnesota lawyers from discipline by the Minnesota Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility (OLPR); those lawyers could conceivably violate rules in their own states. Conversely, Rule 5.5(a) includes a safe harbor that states that a Minnesota lawyer does not violate the rule if his or her conduct in another jurisdiction conforms to what would be permissible for a lawyer licensed in another state who conducts business in Minnesota. Hence, these Rule amendments will protect Minnesota lawyers from

Minnesota discipline, even if another jurisdiction attempted to take disciplinary action against the Minnesota lawyer.

III. Proposed Amendments

A. Clarification of "reasonably related" in Rule 5.5(c)(4).

As noted above, Rule 5.5(c)(4) provides an exception that allows lawyers to practice in another jurisdiction temporarily, if the legal services "arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice" in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed. In *39302*, the Minnesota Supreme Court interpreted the scope of the term "reasonably related" by relying on a portion of a comment to Rule 5.5 that limits the reach of the exception to legal services that are part of a "particular body of federal, nationally-uniform, foreign, or international law. *See* Rule 5.5, cmt. 14. As noted above, the Court invited an amendment to Rule 5.5(c).

"Reasonably" is defined in the MRPC as describing "the conduct of a reasonably prudent and competent lawyer." Rule 1.0(i), R. Prof. Conduct. The proposed amendment is intended to codify what the subcommittee believes that prudent and competent lawyers currently recognize as the scope of what is "reasonably related" to their practices: those areas that are within the lawyer's regular field or fields of practice. A lawyer's expertise in an particular area, whether it be shopping-center leases, nonprofit financing, transgender rights, restaurant franchises, etc., may attract clients regionally or nationally even where the practice area is not subject to a nationally uniform or federal body of law. Clients may seek out lawyers for this expertise and the public is well-served by allowing clients to hire lawyers with subject-matter expertise that suits the client's matter. A lawyer's expertise, gained through regular practice in a field of law provides reasonable assurance of client protection in a temporary practice context.

During the subcommittee's discussions, several committee members described their experiences with prudent and competent lawyers who have been offering services in their fields of practice across state borders on a regular basis. Such conduct was noted in the practices of large firms, corporate law departments, small boutique firms, and others.

The subcommittee, with one dissent, believes that people in Minnesota will be better served and protected by being able to choose among lawyers who regularly practice in a field of law, even without a Minnesota license, rather than by a lawyer who is licensed in Minnesota but has very little experience in the field of practice relevant to the client's matter. The growing complexity of law often makes field of law a better indicator of competence than local licensure. Current comment 14 to Rule 5.5 recognizes "nationally-uniform" law as "reasonably related." Many areas of law could be termed "nationally-similar," without being uniform. For example, the ABA Model Rules of Conduct have been adopted in almost all states, but Minnesota, like many states, has variations that make the law marginally less than "uniform." A Minnesota resident with issues relating to these Rules would be well-served by retaining, for

example, Geoffrey Hazzard or Ronald Rotunda – both nationally-recognized ethics experts, who do not have Minnesota licenses.

The proposed amendment finds support in the *39302* dissent. The *39302* dissent, discussing the appropriate scope of Rule 5.5(c)(4), stated, "One factor provided in Rule 5.5, comment 14, relates to whether the lawyer's temporary services draw on the lawyer's 'expertise developed through the regular practice of law.'" To the extent that Rule 5.5 seeks to protect the public by ensuring competence, experience that arises from a lawyer's regular practice is more likely to accomplish that goal than a lawyer who has little experience in a federal or "nationally-uniform" area of law. Trying to determining what characteristics of a body of law make it "nationally-uniform" but still distinct from federal law would perpetuate uncertainty about when lawyers fall within the protection of Rule 5.5(c)(4).

The proposed amendment uses the term "field or fields of practice." This term has been used in Rule 7.4 for over thirty years, without any reported difficulty in definition or enforcement.

During the subcommittee meetings, Pat Burns expressed his personal reservations that the amendment was too broad in its expansion of the rule and his concerns regarding how the Director's Office would determine what a lawyer's "regular" fields of practice include. Director Susan Humiston has written a letter to RPC committee chair Michael McCarthy, expressing disagreement with several aspects of the proposed amendments. Those arguments are discussed in Section IV, below.

Along with the proposed amendment, we recommend amending comment 14 by deleting a phrase from the final sentence, as follows: "In addition, the services may draw on the lawyer's recognized expertise developed through the regular practice of law on behalf of clients ~~in matters involving a particular body of federal, nationally-uniform, foreign, or international law~~." Rule 5.5 cmt. 14 (cmt. 15 as renumbered below). This is intended to avoid confusion between the amended rule and the comment.

B. <u>New section 5.5(e): representation of relatives and other personal referrals</u>.

This new section is intended to directly address the *Panel 39302* decision and other potential problems related to the continuous (as opposed to temporary) representation of current or former clients that are located in other jurisdictions. The proposal would add a new provision allowing a lawyer to perform legal services in a jurisdiction if the services:

> **are performed on behalf of a person who has a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with the lawyer.**

This amendment accomplishes two purposes. First, it addresses the conundrum in *39302* that the present language of the rule provides no mechanism by which lawyers may provide legal services to family members and friends who happen to reside in other jurisdictions and where the subject matter of the legal issue is not within the

lawyer's usual field of practice. The subcommittee believes that there are many situations in which family members and close friends would turn to a lawyer with whom they have a personal relationship to seek assistance in a legal matter rather than be forced to hire a stranger in their own jurisdiction. This could apply, for example, to a lawyer whose child had a dispute in another jurisdiction with a landlord or a lawyer whose aged parent had a dispute regarding the care provided by a nursing home. In these situations, there is little or no risk of harm to the public of the lawyer conducting the representation because the lawyer is well-known to the client, even if the lawyer has not previously represented that person and even if the lawyer does not have experience in that area of the law.

Second, this amendment would address the scenarios discussed above in which lawyers seek to continue work for clients who have relocated to other jurisdictions or who themselves seek to work from homes in bordering jurisdictions or take extended vacations in other jurisdictions. It is in the public interest to allow clients, including Minnesota clients, to continue working with their lawyers despite changes in the lawyers' geographic locations.

The amendment follows the Court's footnote suggestion that it might entertain a petition to expand the coverage of Rule 5.5(c). In reviewing the rules, the subcommittee determined that the clearest amendment would remove certain trusted relationships from the prohibitions of Rule 5.5(a) entirely. The language "family, close personal, or prior professional relationship" is taken from Rule 7.3, which allows direct solicitation of legal business from persons in those categories, also under the theory that there is little risk of abuse in those situations. The language of Rule 7.3 has been in place for several decades and has not presented enforcement problems for OLPR. A new comment 16 addresses the new language.

C. Amendments to Rules 5.5(b) and (d) to allow a lawyer to continue to serve existing clients from another jurisdiction.

Although not raised directly by *39302*, the issues surrounding when lawyers may practice in other jurisdictions provides an appropriate occasion for Minnesota to consider following the efforts of Arizona and New Hampshire to relax the prohibitions in Rule 5.5(b) against establishing offices in other jurisdictions where the lawyer would only practice the law of the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed.

The amendments would allow a lawyer to move to another state but continue representing clients from the lawyer's licensed state. This is important, for example, when a lawyer moves to another jurisdiction because of a spouse's new job, to be closer to ailing parents, etc. The risk to the public in these situations is very small because the lawyer is simply continuing to do the exact same work that the lawyer did before, just from a different location. Much like the existing exemption in Rule 5.5(d) for lawyers who practice Federal law, such as immigration, this amendment would allow lawyers from other jurisdictions to practice only the law of that jurisdiction. Because the lawyer may not hold out as being licensed in the new jurisdiction, the

lawyer therefore does not compete with the lawyers licensed in the new jurisdiction for clients with matters related to the law of that jurisdiction.

These amendments are found in Rule 5.5(b) and (d) and new comment 5 in the attached version of Rule 5.5. The amendments follow the structure of the rule in Arizona, with the exception that the amendments do not adopt Arizona's provision that the lawyer must advise "the lawyer's client that the lawyer is not admitted to practice in Arizona, and must obtain the client's informed consent to such representation." Minnesota did not adopt these provisions in the 2005 amendments, including Rule 5.5(c). It would be inconsistent to adopt these notice and consent provisions only for the amendments that are now proposed. New Hampshire adopted slightly different amendments in October 2016 that implement the same policy change.

IV. Response to OLPR Director Humiston's Substantive Concerns

In her April 24, 2017 letter to RPC Committee chair Michael McCarthy, Ms. Humiston raises several concerns that merit additional discussion.

Regarding the proposed amendment to Rule 5.5(c)(4) (fields of practice), the Director notes that the majority opinion in *Panel File 39302* rejected the dissent's argument that a field of practice need not be nationally-uniform to qualify as "reasonably related." The Director suggests that the proposed amendment is a "nonstarter" for a majority of the Court. We believe that the Court was interpreting the rule as written to the facts before the Court. The Court's footnote invited amendments and we believe the Court will be open-minded in considering the concerns of the practicing bar.

The Director letter states that the proposed amendments would benefit lawyers in other states, but expresses doubt that the amendments will benefit Minnesota lawyers while increasing risk to Minnesota consumers of legal services. The Director may have overlooked that the safe-harbor provision in Rule 5.5(a) protects Minnesota lawyers from discipline in Minnesota. The amendments, by clarifying the scope of Rule 5.5, protect Minnesota lawyers. Moreover, the amendments benefit Minnesota consumers of legal service, by increasing their range of choices of counsel without exposing them to the primary danger that unauthorized practice regulation seeks to prevent – incompetent representation. If there are harms to consumers arising from these proposed amendments the Director's letter does not identify them.

Ms. Humiston's letter states that the amendments would "enhance a conundrum that already exists in Minnesota for non-Minnesota lawyers, because Minn. Stat. § 481.02, subdiv. 1, would currently prohibit the conduct even if Rule 5.5 would allow it." The subcommittee does not believe there is a "conundrum." If this concern had substance, it would have weighed against the adoption of Rule 5.5(c), in 2005. We are similarly unaware of any policy by the Director's Office to refuse to apply Rule 5.5(c) because of a conflict with § 481.02. The Minnesota Supreme Court has long held that it, rather than the Legislature, has the ultimate authority to define the unauthorized practice of law. *Cardinal v. Merrill Lynch Realty/Burnet, Inc.*, 433 N.W.2d

864, 867 (Minn. 1988), *citing Cowern v. Nelson*, 207 Minn. 642, 647, 290 N.W. 795, 797 (1940). Although Minn. Stat. § 481.02 was mentioned by Justice Lillehaug in the oral argument in *39302*, the Court did not address it in their opinion.

The Director's letter states that other states are already less permissive in multi-jurisdictional practice rules than Minnesota, citing as an example a North Carolina rule. Our intent has been to enhance benefits to Minnesota clients, by increasing their choices of counsel, without increasing their risk. That some other states have stricter rules does not indicate that the restrictions were adopted to benefit the public, rather than to protect local lawyers' interests.

RULE 5.5: UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW; MULTJURISDICTIONAL PRACTICE OF LAW

(a) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction~~;~~, or assist another in doing so, except that a lawyer admitted to practice in Minnesota does not violate this rule by conduct in another jurisdiction that is permitted in Minnesota under Rule 5.5 (c)**,** ~~and~~ (d)**, and (e)** for lawyers not admitted to practice in Minnesota.

(b) A lawyer who is not admitted to practice in ~~this jurisdiction~~**Minnesota** shall not:

(1) except as authorized by these rules or other law, establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of **Minnesota** law; or

(2) hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice **Minnesota** law ~~this jurisdiction~~.

(c) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are undertaken in association with a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction and who actively participates in the matter;

(2) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential proceeding before a tribunal in this or another jurisdiction, if the lawyer, or a person the lawyer is assisting, is authorized by law or order to appear in the proceeding or reasonably expects to be so authorized;

(3) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; or

(4) are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3) and arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice. **Such reasonably-related services include services which are within the lawyer's regular field or fields of practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed to practice law.**

d) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in ~~this jurisdiction~~**Minnesota** that ~~are services that the lawyer is authorized to provide by~~**exclusively involve** federal law or **the** ~~other~~ law of ~~this~~ **another** jurisdiction **in which the lawyer is licensed to practice law.**

(e) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction that are performed on behalf of a person who has a family, close personal, or prior professional relationship with the lawyer.

Comment

[1] A lawyer may practice law only in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice. A lawyer may be admitted to practice law in a jurisdiction on a regular basis or may be authorized by court rule or order or by law to practice for a limited purpose or on a restricted basis. Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law by a lawyer, whether through the lawyer's direct action or by the lawyer assisting another person. The exception is intended to permit a Minnesota lawyer, without violating this rule, to engage in practice in another jurisdiction as Rule 5.5 (c) and (d) permit a lawyer admitted to practice in another jurisdiction to engage in practice in Minnesota. A lawyer who does so in another jurisdiction in violation of its law or rules may be subject to discipline or other sanctions in that jurisdiction.

[2] The definition of the practice of law is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. This rule does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. See Rule 5.3.

[3] A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law; for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants, and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.

[4] Other than as authorized by law or this rule, a lawyer who is not admitted to practice generally in this jurisdiction violates paragraph (b) if the lawyer establishes an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the **general** practice of **the** law **of this jurisdiction**. Presence may be systematic and continuous even if the lawyer is not physically present here. Such a lawyer must not hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also Rules 7.1 and 7.5(b).

[5] Prior versions of Rule 5.5 and prior interpretations of the Rule assumed that attorneys practice in fixed physical offices and only deal with legal issues related to the States in which their offices are located. The increased mobility of attorneys, and, in particular, the ability of attorneys to continue to communicate with and represent their clients from anywhere in the world, are circumstances that were never contemplated by the Rule. The adoption of Rules 5.5(b) and (c) in 2005 reflected the State's growing recognition that multi-jurisdictional practice is a modern reality that must be accommodated by the Rules.

The assumption that a lawyer must be licensed in Minnesota simply because he or she happens to be present in Minnesota no longer makes sense in all instances. Rather than focusing on where a lawyer is physically located, Minnesota's modifications of Rule 5.5(b)(1) and Rule 5.5(d) clarify that a lawyer who is licensed in

another jurisdiction but does not practice Minnesota law need not obtain a Minnesota license to practice law solely because the lawyer is present in Minnesota.

Notwithstanding the Minnesota amendments to Rule 5.5(b)(1) and (2) and Rule 5.5(d)(2), Rule 8.5(a) still provides that a lawyer who is admitted in another jurisdiction, but not in Minnesota, "is also subject to the disciplinary authority of … [Minnesota] if the lawyer provides or offers to provide any legal services in" Minnesota. In particular, such a lawyer will be subject to the provisions of Rules 7.1 through 7.5 regarding the disclosure of the jurisdictional limitations of the lawyer's practice. In addition, Rule 5.5(b)(2) continues to prohibit such a lawyer from holding out to the public or otherwise representing that the lawyer is admitted to practice Minnesota law.

[~~5~~6] There are occasions in which a lawyer admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction under circumstances that do not create an unreasonable risk to the interests of their clients, the public, or the courts. Paragraph (c) identifies four such circumstances. The fact that conduct is not so identified does not imply that the conduct is or is not authorized. With the exception of paragraph (d), this rule does not authorize a lawyer to establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction without being admitted to practice generally here.

[~~6~~7] There is no single test to determine whether a lawyer's services are provided on a "temporary basis" in this jurisdiction, and may therefore be permissible under paragraph (c). Services may be "temporary" even though the lawyer provides services in this jurisdiction on a recurring basis or for an extended period of time, as when the lawyer is representing a client in a single lengthy negotiation or litigation.

[~~7~~8] Paragraphs (c) and (d) apply to lawyers who are admitted to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, which includes the District of Columbia, and any state, territory, or commonwealth of the United States. The word "admitted" in paragraph (c) contemplates that the lawyer is authorized to practice in the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted and excludes a lawyer who while technically admitted is not authorized to practice because, for example, the lawyer is on inactive status.

[~~8~~9] Paragraph (c)(1) recognizes that the interests of clients and the public are protected if a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction associates with a lawyer licensed to practice in this jurisdiction. For this paragraph to apply, however, the lawyer admitted to practice in this jurisdiction must actively participate in and share responsibility for the representation of the client.

[~~9~~10] Lawyers not admitted to practice generally in a jurisdiction may be authorized by law or order of a tribunal or an administrative agency to appear before the tribunal or agency. This authority may be granted pursuant to formal rules governing admission pro hac vice or pursuant to informal practice of the tribunal or agency. Under paragraph (c)(2), a lawyer does not violate this rule when the lawyer appears before a tribunal or agency pursuant to such authority. To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction to obtain admission pro hac vice before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority.

[1~~0~~1] Paragraph (c)(2) also provides that a lawyer rendering services in this jurisdiction on a temporary basis does not violate this rule when the lawyer engages in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law or in which the lawyer reasonably expects to be admitted pro hac vice. Examples of such

conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents. Similarly, a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction may engage in conduct temporarily in this jurisdiction in connection with pending litigation in another jurisdiction in which the lawyer is or reasonably expects to be authorized to appear, including taking depositions in this jurisdiction.

[12~~1~~] When a lawyer has been or reasonably expects to be admitted to appear before a court or administrative agency, paragraph (c)(2) also permits conduct by lawyers who are associated with that lawyer in the matter, but who do not expect to appear before the court or administrative agency. For example, subordinate lawyers may conduct research, review documents, and attend meetings with witnesses in support of the lawyer responsible for the litigation.

[13~~2~~] Paragraph (c)(3) permits a lawyer admitted to practice law in another jurisdiction to perform services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction if those services are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice. The lawyer, however, must obtain admission pro hac vice in the case of a court-annexed arbitration or mediation or otherwise if court rules or law so require.

[14~~13~~] Paragraph (c)(4) permits a lawyer admitted in another jurisdiction to provide certain legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted but are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3). These services include both legal services and services that nonlawyers may perform but that are considered the practice of law when performed by lawyers.

[15~~14~~] Paragraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) require that the services arise out of or be reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. A variety of factors evidence such a relationship. The lawyer's client may have been previously represented by the lawyer, or may be resident in or have substantial contacts with the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. The matter, although involving other jurisdictions, may have a significant connection with that jurisdiction. In other cases, significant aspects of the lawyer's work might be conducted in that jurisdiction or a significant aspect of the matter may involve the law of that jurisdiction. The necessary relationship might arise when the client's activities or the legal issues involve multiple jurisdictions, such as when the officers of a multinational corporation survey potential business sites and seek the services of their lawyer in assessing the relative merits of each. In addition, the services may draw on the lawyer's recognized expertise developed through the regular practice of law on behalf of clients ~~in matters involving a particular body of federal, nationally-uniform, foreign, or international law.~~.

[16] Paragraph (e) recognizes that lawyers are often sought out by former clients, family members, personal friends, and other professional relationships for legal advice and assistance, even though the person is domiciled in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed. The risk of harm to the public in such situations is very low and is outweighed by the value inherent in clients being able to choose lawyers they trust.

[17~~15~~] Paragraph (d) identifies a circumstance in which a lawyer who is admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and is not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law as well as provide legal services on a temporary basis. Except as provided in paragraph (d), a lawyer who is admitted to practice law in another

jurisdiction and who establishes an office or other systematic or continuous presence in this jurisdiction must become admitted to practice law generally in this jurisdiction.

[~~16~~18] Paragraph (d) recognizes that a lawyer may provide legal services in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed when authorized to do so by federal or other law, which includes statute, court rule, executive regulation, or judicial precedent.

[~~17~~19] A lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) or otherwise is subject to the disciplinary authority of this jurisdiction. See Rule 8.5(a).

[~~18~~20] In some circumstances, a lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) may have to inform the client that the lawyer is not licensed to practice law in this jurisdiction. For example, such notice may be required when the representation occurs primarily in this jurisdiction and requires knowledge of the law of this jurisdiction. See Rule 1.4(b).

[~~19~~21] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications advertising legal services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 to 7.5.

[~~20~~22] In some circumstances, a lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) may have to inform the client that the lawyer is not licensed to practice law in this jurisdiction. For example, such notice may be required when the representation occurs primarily in this jurisdiction and requires knowledge of the law of this jurisdiction. See Rule 1.4(b). **An attorney who is not licensed in Minnesota but who limits his or her practice in Minnesota to federal law or the law of another jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed pursuant to Rule 5.5(d), must note the lawyer's jurisdictional limitations when identifying the lawyer on letterhead, on a website, or in other manners. *See* Rule 7.5(b).**

[~~21~~23] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications advertising legal services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services to prospective clients in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 to 7.5.