

O'Donnell, Shanna

From: Phillips, James <jcphillips@chapman.edu>
Sent: Friday, May 7, 2021 12:56 AM
To: Rules Committee
Cc: Del Ciampo, Joseph
Subject: RE: Comment on Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to resubmit my previous comment to proposed Rule 8.4(7) for the public hearing next week.
 Thanks,
 James Phillips

From: Rules Committee <RulesCommittee@jud.ct.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 10:33 AM
To: Phillips, James <jcphillips@chapman.edu>
Cc: Del Ciampo, Joseph <Joseph.DelCiampo@jud.ct.gov>
Subject: RE: Comment on Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

External Message

We have received your comments and will add them to the materials related to this proposal.

Thank you,

Shanna O'Donnell

Research Attorney, Legal Services
 Connecticut Judicial Branch
 100 Washington Street, 3rd Flr
 Hartford, CT 06106
 860-706-5120

This e-mail and any attachments or links transmitted with it are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be protected by the attorney/client privilege, work product doctrine, or other confidentiality provision. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, dissemination, distribution, use, or action taken in reliance on the contents of this communication is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this in error and delete this e-mail and any attachments and links from your system. Any inadvertent receipt or transmission shall not be a waiver of any privilege or work product protection. The Connecticut Judicial Branch does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this communication which arise as a result of e-mail transmission, or for any viruses that may be contained therein. If verification of the contents of this e-mail is required, please request a hard-copy version.

From: Phillips, James <jcphillips@chapman.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 12:31 PM
To: Rules Committee <RulesCommittee@jud.ct.gov>
Subject: Comment on Proposed Rule 8.4(7)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Connecticut Rules Committee of the Superior Court,

I write to comment on Connecticut Proposed Rule 8.4(7). I appreciate the thought and effort that has gone into this proposed rule. Certainly, discrimination and harassment have no place in our society and especially no place in a profession that seeks to uphold the rule of law.

Still, the rule, in its current form, is deeply problematic. Discrimination and harassment are vague concepts prone to the human psychological tendencies of confirmation bias and motivated reasoning. We have probably all said something that had absolutely no ill intent, but that was interpreted by another as offensive. Given this, discrimination and harassment need a higher standard than just “reasonably should know” since what is reasonable will be entirely in the eye of body passing judgement on the attorney.

Further, this rule sweeps very broadly, covering any “conduct related to the practice of law.” This could arguably include casual conversations between an attorney and a prospective client at a golf tournament, conversations between attorneys at a firm social event, or arguments an attorney needs to make on behalf of her client in court. Ours is a profession that needs to be able to grapple with society’s toughest issues. And a rule dealing with vague concepts, a low standard for violating the rule, and with such broad coverage that an attorney never knows when it applies and when it doesn’t will make the cure worse than the disease.

Finally, many firms seek to promote racial and gender diversity in their workforce. These efforts, however, would likely run afoul of the proposed rule, resulting in unintended discrimination or harassment against white males, for example.

For these reasons, I encourage the Committee to abandon the proposed rule in its current form.

Sincerely,

James Phillips

Assistant Professor of Law
Fowler School of Law
Chapman University

NOTE: This email originated from outside Chapman’s network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know content is safe.