ACCOUNTABILITY OR OVERKILL: DISCLINING PRIVATE BEHAVIOR

BY EDWARD J. CLEARY

"There is . . . a danger in a too expansive interpretation of what constitutes misconduct subject to discipline."

At what point does a lawyer's "private" conduct become grounds for professional discipline? It is true that some private conduct has resulted in professional repercussions for decades, particularly serious criminal conduct. Over the years, other areas of misbehavior, not directly tied to professional activities, have been added as grounds for discipline. These areas include the failure to file or pay personal income taxes, having sexual relations with a current client, or willfully failing to comply with court-ordered child support and spousal maintenance. On the other hand, it could well be argued that overzealous disciplinary counsel should be restrained from overseeing and judging lawyers' personal lives without a nexus to professional activities. Most would agree that egregious personal misconduct (i.e., a felony conviction, extensive nonfiling of tax returns, ignoring a court order, etc.) falls within the ambit of "professional" misconduct. The problem is identifying where the line is drawn thereafter.

RULE 8.4 MISCONDUCT

Rule 8.4 of the Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct (and of the Model Rules as well) provides the framework within which "professional" misconduct is addressed:

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

(a) 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;

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

(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

(d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

(e) harass a person on the basis of sex, race, age, creed, religion, color, national origin, disability, sexual preference or marital status in connection with a lawyer's professional activities;

Rule 8.4(a) clarifies that direct or indirect violation of the remaining provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct is in itself professional misconduct. For the most part, the other rules address activities commonly thought of as professional in nature, but 1.8(k), which prohibits sexual relations with a current client (unless the relationship existed when the lawyer-client relationship commenced), which some might consider personal in nature, was clarified as relating to a lawyer's professional activities when the rule was amended in 1994.

Rule 8.4(b) addresses the committing of a "criminal act," but does not specify how serious the act must be. The comment to the rule notes that "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 the practice of law . . . involving violence, dishonesty, or breach of trust or serious inter-
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Calif.—Why do some lawyers get rich while others struggle to pay their bills? “That’s simple,” says California attorney David M. Ward. “Successful lawyers know how to market their services.” Once a struggling solo practitioner, Ward credits his turnaround to a referral marketing system he developed six years ago. “I went from dead broke to earning $300,000 a year, practically overnight,” he says. Ward has written a new report, “How to Get More Clients In A Month Than You Now Get All Year!” The report shows how any lawyer can use this marketing system to get more clients and increase their income.
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THE MINNESOTA EXPERIENCE

In the past decade, this office has been circumspect in applying 8.4 to personal activity. In 1990 a previous Director privately cited an attorney for violating 8.4(c) by misrepresenting the condition of his home. The attorney in question had stated in disclosure papers that his home had a partial basement without water problems while concealing the portion of the basement that had suffered severe water damage. While noting that the misrepresenta-
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

tation had occurred outside of the practice of law, the Director went on to note that 8.4(c) applied to all conduct which reflects adversely on the practice of law and that if the victim of the misrepresentation had been a client, public discipline would have been appropriate. More recently, in 1995, also under a previous Director, an attorney was the subject of a complaint regarding the failure to pay a water bill in a personal real estate transaction. While the complaint was dismissed based on its reference to conduct occurring outside the practice of law, the attorney was eventually disciplined under 8.4(d) for contacting the complainant and for engaging in abusive statements and intimidation after the dismissal. *Here the lawyer handed the Court the professional nexus required, namely the abusive conduct of the lawyer towards the complainant following the filing of the complaint.*

CONCLUSION

Deciding on when the personal becomes the professional will often be difficult, despite a consensus regarding the outside parameters of such misconduct. While all of us in the legal profession would benefit from an improved public image, stretching disciplinary jurisdiction to cover all of a lawyer’s activities is dangerous and unwarranted. Rule 8.4 adequately outlines when it is justifiable to treat personal conduct as professional in nature in seeking discipline. While our mandate remains the protection of the public, we must resist imposing our personal values on a lawyer’s private activities if there is no professional nexus and if the conduct does not fall under the provisions of 8.4, MRPC.
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