

**Del Ciampo, Joseph****Subject:** Proposal concerning the Commentary to Rule 7.1 from Judge John Moore

**From:** Moore, John <[John.D.Moore@jud.ct.gov](mailto:John.D.Moore@jud.ct.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 6, 2019 10:39 AM  
**To:** McDonald, Andrew <[Andrew.McDonald@connapp.jud.ct.gov](mailto:Andrew.McDonald@connapp.jud.ct.gov)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Rules Changes

Hi, Andrew. Hope all is well with you. Just a thought or question on the proposed changes to the Commentary to Rule 7.1.

I can see that the amendments to the Commentary seek to flesh out what "misleading truthful statements" are. That makes good sense. What I am puzzled a little by is the interposition of the first sentence in the third paragraph of the Commentary to 7.1. It seems unnecessary, because Rule 8.4 (3) already lawyers in no uncertain terms that engaging in dishonest, fraudulent, deceitful conduct or in a misrepresentation is professional misconduct. Rule 8.4 (3) also does so with the authoritative force of a Rule, as opposed to the guidance of a Commentary. If the thought behind adding this sentence to the Commentary is to remind lawyers that it is professional misconduct to communicate in a truthful, but misleading way, I do not think that the new sentence accomplishes that goal. I don't think that the phrase "dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation" includes conduct that is "truthful, but misleading." If the goal is to remind lawyers that they are subject to discipline for making truthful, but misleading statements, I think we have to add "misleading" to the phrase, perhaps as "dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or a misleading communication." Without doing that, I don't see what that sentence adds.

Best, JD

~~~~~

Hon. John D. Moore  
Judge, Superior Court  
Connecticut Judicial Branch  
Email: [john.d.moore@jud.ct.gov](mailto:john.d.moore@jud.ct.gov)

**\*  
Rule 7.1. Communications concerning a Lawyer's Services**

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

COMMENTARY: This Rule governs all communications about a lawyer's services, including advertising [permitted by Rule 7.2]. Whatever means are used to make known a lawyer's services, statements about them must be truthful. [Statements, even if literally true, that are m]Misleading truthful statements are [also] prohibited by this Rule. A truthful statement is misleading if it omits a fact necessary to make the lawyer's communication considered as a whole not materially misleading. A truthful statement is [also] misleading if [there is] a substantial likelihood exists that it will lead a reasonable person to formulate a specific conclusion about the lawyer or the lawyer's services for which there is no reasonable factual foundation. A truthful statement also is misleading if presented in a way that leads a reasonable person to believe the lawyer's communication requires that person to take further action when, in fact, no action is required.

A[n advertisement] communication that truthfully reports a lawyer's achievements on behalf of clients or former clients may be misleading if presented without a disclaimer indicating that the communicated result is based upon the particular facts of that case so as to lead a reasonable person to form an unjustified expectation that the same results could be obtained for other clients in similar matters without

reference to the specific factual and legal circumstances of each client's case. Similarly, an unsubstantiated claim about a lawyer's or law firm's services or fees, or an unsubstantiated comparison of the lawyer's services or fees with [the services or fees] those of other lawyers or law firms may be misleading if presented with such specificity as would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the comparison or claim can be substantiated. The inclusion of an appropriate disclaimer or qualifying language may preclude a finding that a statement is likely to create unjustified expectations or otherwise mislead the public.

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation. Rule 8.4 (3). See also Rule 8.4 (5) for the prohibition against stating or implying an ability to improperly influence [improperly] a government agency or official or to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.

Firm names, letterhead and professional designations are communications concerning a lawyer's services. A firm may be designated by the names of all or some of its current members, by the names of deceased or retired members where there has been a succession in the firm's identity or by a trade name if it is not false or misleading. A lawyer or law firm also may be designated by a distinctive website address, social media username or comparable professional designation that is not misleading. A law firm name or designation is misleading if it implies a connection with a government agency, with a deceased lawyer who was not a former member of the firm, with a lawyer not

associated with the firm or a predecessor firm, with a nonlawyer or with a public or charitable legal services organization. If a firm uses a trade name that includes a geographical name such as "Springfield Legal Clinic," an express statement explaining that it is not a public legal aid organization may be required to avoid a misleading implication.

Letterhead identification of the lawyers in the office of the firm shall indicate the jurisdictional limitations on those not licensed to practice in the jurisdiction where the office is located.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NOTE: The following revisions were made to incorporate the 2018 amendments to the American Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional Conduct concerning attorney advertising: amendments to Rules 7.1 through 7.3, Rule 7.4A, and Section 2-28A and the repeal of Rules 7.4 and 7.5.

*\* Changes noted effective 1-1-2020*

#### **Rule 8.4. Misconduct**

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

(1) Violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;

(2) Commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects;

(3) Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

(4) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

(5) State or imply an ability to influence improperly a government agency or official or to achieve results by means that violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law; or

(6) Knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law.

(P.B. 1978-1997, Rule 8.4.) (Amended June 26, 2006, to take effect Jan. 1, 2007.)

COMMENTARY: Lawyers are subject to discipline when they violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so or do so through the acts of another, as when they request or instruct an agent to do so on the lawyer's behalf. Subdivision (1), however, does not prohibit a lawyer from advising a client concerning action the client is legally entitled to take.

Many kinds of illegal conduct reflect adversely on fitness to practice law, such as offenses involving fraud and the offense of wilful failure to file an income tax return. However, some kinds of offenses carry no such implication. Traditionally, the distinction was drawn in terms of offenses involving "moral turpitude." That concept can be construed to include offenses concerning some matters of personal morality, such as adultery and comparable offenses, which have no specific connection to fitness for the practice of law. Although a lawyer is personally answerable to the entire criminal law, a lawyer should be professionally answerable only for offenses that indicate lack of those characteristics relevant to law practice. Offenses involving violence, dishonesty, breach of trust, or serious interference with the administration of justice are in that category. A pattern of repeated offenses, even ones of minor significance when considered separately, can indicate indifference to legal obligation. Counseling or assisting a client with regard to conduct expressly permitted under Connecticut law is not conduct that reflects adversely on a lawyer's fitness notwithstanding any conflict with federal or other law. Nothing in this commentary shall be construed to provide a defense to a presentment filed pursuant to Practice Book Section 2-41.

A lawyer who, in the course of representing a client, knowingly manifests by words or conduct, bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation or socioeconomic status, violates subdivision (4) when such actions are prejudicial to the administration of justice. Legitimate advocacy respecting the foregoing factors does not violate subdivision (4).

A lawyer may refuse to comply with an obligation imposed by law upon a good faith belief that no valid obligation exists. The provisions of Rule 1.2 (d) concerning a good faith challenge to the validity, scope, meaning or application of the law apply to challenges of legal regulation of the practice of law.

Lawyers holding public office assume legal responsibilities going beyond those of other citizens. A lawyer's abuse of public office can suggest an inability to fulfill the professional role of a lawyer. The same is true of abuse of positions of private trust, such as trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, agent and officer, director or manager of a corporation or other organization.