



October 14, 2020

Clerk of the Supreme Court
Temple of Justice
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Re: Stakeholder Outreach for Proposed Comment to Rule of Professional Conduct 6.5

Dear Honorable Members of the Washington State Supreme Court:

The Pro Bono Council is a convening body to represent and advocate for the network of sixteen individual Volunteer Lawyer Programs (VLPs) in Washington. VLPs provide free, high quality, efficient, and innovative civil legal assistance to low income people through the recruitment, training, supervision, and support of volunteer lawyers. Each VLP is affiliated with a county bar association and is governed by a board of directors or steering committee comprised of local attorneys and other community members. Each VLP coordinates local attorneys and other volunteers to provide pro bono help at legal clinics and other service delivery models.

The Pro Bono Council is committed to increasing access to justice for as many eligible Washingtonians as possible. Our proposed change to Rule of Professional Conduct (RPC) 6.5 furthers access to free legal help by allowing pro bono volunteers to rely on a legal services program's screening mechanisms to avoid direct conflicts of interest at legal clinics.

The Pro Bono Council submitted a very similar amendment previously which received no negative feedback when opened for comment, but with the onset of the COVID-19 emergency the prior proposal was withdrawn until we could dedicate the resources to ensure its proper submission. As we now have capacity and as COVID-19 has highlighted the importance of the current proposal for the safety of legal aid clients, we now request the Court expedite this proposed amendment to the extent possible.

The current submission achieves the same substantive objectives as the earlier one. However, we have incorporated several changes to the language that were recommended by a subcommittee of the Washington State Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics that was formed to review the original version of this proposal. These changes are intended to ensure the suggested amendments are consistent with the requirements of RPC Scope ¶ 21.

To support the suggested amendment to RPC 6.5, members of the Pro Bono Council reached out to the Washington State Access to Justice (ATJ) Board

MEMBERS
ELOISE BARSHES, CO-CHAIR
ELIZABETH FITZGEARLD, CO-CHAIR
LORI BASHOR-SARANCIK
QUINN DALAN
ANNE DALY
LAURIE DAVENPORT
CHRIS GRAVES
MICHAEL HEATHERLY
JERRY KRÖON
VEANEY MARTINEZ
SHAUNA ROGERS MCCLAIN
RACHAEL LUNDMARK
BARB OTTE
GAIL SMITH
JOANNE SPRAGUE
EVA WESCOTT
CATHERINE BROWN

CONTACT
MICHAEL TERASAKI
PRO BONO COUNCIL MANAGER
(425) 495-0132
MICHAEL@PROBONOCOUNCIL.ORG



and the community of civil legal services providers through the ATJ Board's Delivery System Committee. The Delivery System Committee includes representatives of legal aid organizations such as Benefits Law Center, Columbia Legal Services, Lavender Rights Project, Legal Foundation of Washington, Northwest Justice Project, Office of Civil Legal Aid, Seattle University School of Law Access to Justice Institute, Solid Ground Benefits Assistance Center, Sexual Violence Law Center, TeamChild, Tenant Law Center, Unemployment Law Project, and many more. At the Delivery System Committee's September 2020 meeting, the Pro Bono Council explained the need to propose a small change and comment to RPC 6.5 and asked for feedback from the community of legal services providers. Committee members expressed that the rule change and comment are moves in the right direction and offered no ideas for additional outreach to organizations with an interest in the comment.

In addition to approval and support from many smaller legal aid organizations, the Access to Justice Board voted to support this rule change at the September 25, 2020 meeting, and the Access to Justice Board will additionally submit separate letter of support.

Thank you for your attention to our concern. Please contact Pro Bono Council Manager, Michael Terasaki should you have additional questions about this letter.

Sincerely,

/s/Michael Terasaki

Michael Terasaki

Pro Bono Council Manager

michael@probonocouncil.org

(425) 495-0132

GR 9 COVER SHEET

Suggested Amendment to RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (RPC)

Rule 6.5 -- NONPROFIT AND COURT-ANNEXED LIMITED LEGAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Submitted by the Pro Bono Council

A. Name of Proponent:

Pro Bono Council. As a subcommittee of the Washington State Access to Justice Board, the Pro Bono Council is a convening body that supports and advocates for the sixteen volunteer lawyer programs across the State.

B. Spokesperson:

Michael Terasaki
Pro Bono Council Manager
Michael@probonocouncil.org
1239 120th Avenue NE, Suite J
Bellevue 98005
(425)495-0132

C. Purpose:

To obtain clarifying language and comment to Rule of Professional Conduct (RPC) 6.5 allowing a limited legal service program to provide notice, as described in paragraph (a)(3) of the Rule, at the time an individual applies for service, regardless of whether an actual conflict exists at that time.

RPC 6.5 allows non-profit and court-annexed limited legal services programs to offer short-term legal services to clients whose legal interests may be in conflict by exempting such representation from RPCs 1.7, 1.9(a), and 1.18(c), unless a participating lawyer has personal knowledge of a conflict and the conflict cannot be mitigated by specific screening measures. This exemption maximizes the limited resources of limited legal service programs and participating lawyers (pro bono and staff) to provide free legal help to eligible persons. A limited legal service program must utilize effective screening mechanisms to ensure confidential information is not disseminated to an attorney who is disqualified from assisting a client with competing interests because of a known personal conflict.¹ A limited legal service program must provide each client with notice of the conflict and the screening

¹ RPC 6.5(a)(3)(i)

mechanisms used to avoid the dissemination of confidential information relating to the representation of the competing interests.² Finally, a limited legal service program must also be able to demonstrate by convincing evidence that no material information relating to the representation was transmitted to the opposing client's attorney.³

Neither the rule nor the comments prescribe how the notice is to be provided, but as currently written, in a known conflict situation, providing individualized notice of an actual conflict creates the potential for inconsistency with the duty of confidentiality codified in RPC 1.6 because the identity of clients involved in the conflict can logically be traced by receipt of that notice alone. This is particularly concerning in many of the cases handled by limited legal service programs in Washington State, because providing individualized notice of a conflict creates safety issues for actual and potential clients who may be seeking protection orders.

Client safety issues in limited legal services programs often arise in cases involving domestic violence. Protection from domestic violence is an area of significant legal need across the country and in Washington. This is borne out by the Washington State Supreme Court-sponsored Civil Legal Needs Study Update of 2015 (Study). The Study found that 71 percent of low-income households in Washington face at least one civil legal problem during a 12-month period.⁴ Further, 76 percent of persons living in poverty who have significant legal needs in Washington cannot get the legal help or representation they need to resolve the problem.⁵ More importantly for purposes of this suggested amendment, the Study confirmed that victims of domestic violence and/or sexual assault experience the highest number of legal problems per capita of any group: low-income Washingtonians who have suffered domestic violence or been a victim of sexual assault experience an average of 19.7 legal problems per household, twice the average experienced by the general low-income population.⁶

Several limited legal service programs, including volunteer lawyer programs, offer legal advice clinics for survivors of domestic violence (DV). If a DV survivor seeks legal aid services while their abuser is a current or former client of that program, under RPC 1.7 or 1.9 there could be a conflict of interest. As described above, RPC 6.5 allows a limited legal service program to provide short-term limited assistance to the conflicted client, who may be the victim/survivor, through the mechanism of screening any personally conflicted attorney(s) from the case and notifying both parties. The current process raises the immediate concern that providing individualized notice of the actual conflict to each party creates an imminent risk of harm to the victim by alerting an alleged DV perpetrator that their victim is seeking legal advice. Thus, the current notice requirement puts the safety of victims/survivors in greater jeopardy. As a collateral matter, RPC 1.6 counsels the exercise of caution when disclosing client information that is likely to result in imminent harm to a third-party.⁷ As a

² RPC 6.5(a)(3)(ii)

³ RPC 6.5(a)(3)(iii)

⁴ 2015 Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study Update, p. 5, at https://ocla.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/CivilLegalNeedsStudy_October2015_V21_Final10_14_15.pdf.

⁵ *Id.* at p. 15.

⁶ *Id.* at p. 13.

⁷ See RPC 1.6 Comment [6].

result of the lack of clarity on this issue, some limited legal service programs opt instead to follow a strict policy of not accepting clients where there is a known conflict, which then results in the opposite outcome to the underlying goal of RPC 6.5: to increase access to free limited legal services for low-income Washingtonians.

The suggested amendment to RPC 6.5 provides important clarity regarding the notice requirement. This guidance will enable any non-profit or court-annexed limited legal service program that satisfies the provisions of RPC 6.5(a) to serve clients who face compounding challenges to seeking legal assistance and who might otherwise be barred from obtaining the help they need due to barriers unwittingly posed by the RPCs. At the same time, limited legal service programs are able to help keep those clients safe during the course of their legal matter without fear of increasing their risk of harm. The suggested amendment will allow limited legal service programs to notify ALL actual and potential clients at the time an individual applies for help of the potential for conflicts and information about the screening mechanisms. This fulfills RPC 6.5's goal to maximize the accessibility of legal aid to as many individuals as possible while still protecting an individual client's interests, safety and confidentiality within the bounds of attorneys' professional duties.

Additionally, providing notice of the potential for conflicts and the screening mechanisms to all applicants for short-term legal services creates an opportunity for applicants to immediately opt out of receiving services if they feel doing so would be in their best interests. Providing notice only after an actual conflict arises, as usually happens under the current rule, allows no opportunity for clients to opt out or raise objections beforehand.

D. Hearing:

A hearing is not requested, but if the Court seeks further information or a hearing, the Pro Bono Council is happy to make itself available and requests notice of any relevant hearing calendared. The Pro Bono Council has conducted stakeholder outreach on this issue. Please see the attached supporting materials.

E. Expedited Consideration:

Expedited consideration is requested and is proper in order to protect the safety of legal aid clients. The ongoing COVID-19 related crisis and associated legal issues, including evictions, have brought an unprecedented number of new legal aid clients. This increase in volume will necessarily result in an increase in the potential for conflicts, and in order to protect the physical safety of as many legal aid clients as possible, and in light of the significant open comment period already conducted, the Pro Bono Council requests the proposed changes be implemented as soon as possible.

F. Supporting Materials:

Statement regarding stakeholder outreach conducted by Pro Bono Council

1 **SUGGESTED RULE CHANGES**

2 **RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

3 Recommended by the Pro Bono Council

4
5 **RPC 6.5**

6 **NONPROFIT AND COURT-ANNEXED LIMITED LEGAL SERVICE PROGRAMS**

7
8 (a) A lawyer who, under the auspices of a program sponsored by a nonprofit organization or
9 court, provides short-term limited legal services to a client without expectation by either the lawyer
10 or the client that the lawyer will provide continuing representation in the matter and without
11 expectation that the lawyer will receive a fee from the client for the services provided:

12 (1) is subject to Rules 1.7, 1.9(a), and 1.18(c) only if the lawyer knows that the
13 representation of the client involves a conflict of interest, except that those Rules shall not prohibit
14 a lawyer from providing limited legal services sufficient only to determine eligibility of the client
15 for assistance by the program and to make an appropriate referral of the client to another program;

16 (2) is subject to Rule 1.10 only if the lawyer knows that another lawyer or LLLT associated
17 with the lawyer in a law firm is disqualified by Rule 1.7 or 1.9(a) or by LLLT RPC 1.7 and LLLT
18 RPC 1.9(a) with respect to the matter; and

19 (3) notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), is not subject to Rules 1.7, 1.9(a), 1.10, or
20 1.18(c) in providing limited legal services to a client if:

21 (i) the program lawyers or LLLTs representing the opposing clients are screened by
22 effective means from information relating to the representation of the opposing client;

23 (ii) each client is notified of the conflict and the screening mechanism used to prohibit
24 dissemination of information relating to the representation; such notice, may be given
25 prospectively; and

26 (iii) the program is able to demonstrate by convincing evidence that no material
27 information relating to the representation of the opposing client was transmitted by the personally
disqualified lawyers or LLLTs to the lawyer representing the conflicting client before
implementation of the screening mechanism and notice to the opposing client.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a)(2), Rule 1.10 is inapplicable to a representation
governed by this Rule.

(c) Prospective notice shall satisfy the requirements of (a)(3)(ii) only if the assistance provided
to both conflicting clients is limited legal service as governed by Rule 6.5.

[Adopted effective October 29, 2002; amended effective September 1, 2006; April 14, 2015.]

Comment

[1] [Washington revision] Legal services organizations, courts and various nonprofit organizations have established programs through which lawyers provide short-term limited legal services - such as advice or the completion of legal forms - that will assist persons to address their legal problems without further representation by a lawyer. In these programs, such as legal-advice hotlines, advice-only clinics or pro se counseling programs, a client-lawyer relationship is established, but there is no expectation that the lawyer's representation of the client will continue beyond the limited consultation. Such programs are normally operated under circumstances in which it is not feasible for a lawyer to systematically screen for conflicts of interest as is generally required before undertaking a representation. See, e.g., Rules 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, and 1.18.

[2] [Washington revision] A lawyer who provides short-term limited legal services pursuant to this Rule must secure the client's informed consent to the limited scope of the representation. See Rule 1.2(c). If a short-term limited representation would not be reasonable under the circumstances, the lawyer may offer advice to the client but must also advise the client of the need for further assistance of a legal practitioner. Except as provided in this Rule, the Rules of Professional Conduct, including Rules 1.6 and 1.9(c), are applicable to the limited representation.

[Comment [2] amended effective April 14, 2015.]

[3] [Washington revision] Because a lawyer who is representing a client in the circumstances addressed by this Rule ordinarily is not able to check systematically for conflicts of interest, paragraph (a) requires compliance with Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a), or 1.18(c) only if the lawyer knows that the representation presents a conflict of interest for the lawyer, and with Rule 1.10 only if the lawyer knows that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm is disqualified by Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a) in the matter.

[4] Because the limited nature of the services significantly reduces the risk of conflicts of interest with other matters being handled by the lawyer's firm, paragraph (b) provides that Rule 1.10 is inapplicable to a representation governed by this Rule except as provided by paragraph (a)(2). Paragraph (a)(2) requires the participating lawyer to comply with Rule 1.10 when the lawyer knows that the lawyer's firm is disqualified by Rules 1.7 or 1.9(a). By virtue of paragraph (b), however, a lawyer's participation in a short-term limited legal services program will not preclude the lawyer's firm from undertaking or continuing the representation of a client with interests adverse to a client being represented under the program's auspices. Nor will the personal disqualification of a lawyer participating in the program be imputed to other lawyers participating in the program.

1 [5] If, after commencing a short-term limited representation in accordance with this Rule, a
2 lawyer undertakes to represent the client in the matter on an ongoing basis, Rules 1.7, 1.9(a) and
3 1.10 become applicable.

4 Additional Washington Comments (6 - ~~78~~)

5 [6] Washington's version of this Rule differs from the Model Rule. The differences
6 accommodate the unique civil legal services delivery system, which uses a statewide centralized
7 telephone intake and referral system for low-income persons to access free civil legal services. The
8 Rule recognizes that lawyers who provide intake and referral services such as these will necessarily
9 at times receive confidential information from adverse parties.
10 The risk that such information will be used against the material interests of either party is relatively
11 low in comparison to the need for services, and when such a risk exists, protections of lawyer
12 screening and notice to the client are required by the Rule.

13 [7] Paragraph (a)(3) was taken from former Washington RPC 6.5(a)(3) as enacted in 2002. The
14 replacement of "confidences and secrets" in paragraph (a)(3) with "information relating to the
15 representation" was necessary to conform the language of the Rule to a terminology change in
16 Rule 1.6. No substantive change is intended. See Comment [21] to Rule 1.6.

17 [8] Providing prospective notice of a potential conflict in accordance with Paragraphs (a)(3)(ii)
18 and (c) would be particularly appropriate in situations where vulnerable client populations may be
19 involved. For example, where a nonprofit or court-annexed limited legal service program is
20 assisting a survivor of domestic violence and the perpetrator of the domestic violence seeks, or
21 previously received, assistance through the same program. In such cases, notification to the
22 perpetrator when the conflict arises could effectively advise the perpetrator that the survivor is
23 contemplating legal action potentially affecting the perpetrator, thus putting the survivor at risk of
24 retaliation.

25 [Comments adopted effective September 1, 2006; amended effective April 14, 2015; September
26 1, 2016.]
27



MEMBERS

Francis Adewale
Esperanza Borboa
Judge Laura T. Bradley
Hon. Frederick P. Corbit
Hon. David S. Keenan
Lindy Laurence
Michelle Lucas
Salvador A. Mungia, Chair
Mirya Muñoz-Roach
Terry J. Price

STAFF

Diana Singleton
Equity and Justice Manager
(206) 727-8205
dianas@wsba.org



THE ALLIANCE
for Equal Justice
MEMBER

October 9, 2020

Justice Charles Johnson
Washington State Supreme Court
415 12th Ave SW W
Olympia, WA 98504
Sent Via Email: supreme@courts.wa.gov

Re: Pro Bono Council's Proposed Changes to RPC 6.5

Dear Justice Johnson,

I write on behalf of the Access to Justice Board in support of changes to RPC 6.5 intended to ensure that attorneys appropriately screen conflicts among clients in the provision of short-term limited legal services, while also protecting particularly vulnerable clients.

The Access to Justice Board has been following efforts to make changes to RPC 6.5 for some time, and has heard multiple presentation on the topic. The Board supports effective screening for client conflicts and recognizes the tension current screening requirements present in instances where notice of a conflict to one client may compromise the safety of another client.

As the new proposed comment to RPC 6.5 reflects, where a perpetrator of domestic violence receives short-term limited legal services and the victim seeks services from the same provider, notice at the time the potential conflict arises could put the victim in further jeopardy.

We know from the 2015 Civil Legal Needs Study that low-income domestic violence victims experience on average nearly twenty civil legal needs each year. Consequently, the ATJ Board supports this important change to RPC 6.5, which will allow attorneys providing short-term limited legal services to manage conflicts while also providing legal aid to especially vulnerable clients.

Sincerely,

Francis Adewale, Chair
Access to Justice Board

Cc: Terra Nevitt, Executive Director, WSBA
Michael Terasaki, Manager, Pro Bono Council

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Linford, Tera](#)
Cc: [Tracy, Mary](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Amendment to RPC 6.5
Date: Thursday, October 15, 2020 8:01:39 AM
Attachments: [2020.10.14 PBC Letter to Supreme Court.pdf](#)
[2020.10.14 PBC - REVISED RPC 6.5 Proposal.pdf](#)
[2020.10.14 PBC - REVISED RPC 6.5 Proposal.docx](#)
[2020.10.14 RPC 6.5 Comment GR 9 COVER SHEET.pdf](#)
[2020.08.10.RPC 6.5.ATJ Board.pdf](#)

From: Michael Terasaki [mailto:michael@probonocouncil.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 4:56 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Proposed Amendment to RPC 6.5

External Email Warning! This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

Dear Washington Supreme Court Justices and Clerks,

Please find attached proposed amendment to RPC 6.5, associated GR 9 cover sheet, and letters in support of the proposed amendment.

Please contact me if I can help facilitate the review and consideration process.

Sincerely,
Michael Terasaki

Michael Terasaki
Washington Pro Bono Council Manager
michael@probonocouncil.org
(425) 495-0132