

PREFACE

MASSACHUSETTS RULES OF COURT

VOLUME I – STATE

2013



Mat #41259019

MASSACHUSETTS
RULES OF COURT

VOLUME 1 - STATE

© 2013 Thomson Reuters

This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered; however, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

ISBN 978-0-314-65427-4

West's and Westlaw are registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.



THOMSON REUTERS



010985124 2nd

RULE 3:07. MASSACHUSETTS RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND COMMENTS

Adopted June 9, 1997, effective January 1, 1998.

Table of Contents

[This Table of Contents is for convenience of reference and is not part of the Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct or the order adopting such rules.]

[Pub. Note: Each rule is followed by an official Comment section. The Supreme Judicial Court order adopting this new rule refers to "new Rule 3:07 (Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct and Comments)"]

PREAMBLE AND SCOPE	Rule
Rule	4.3. Dealing With Unrepresented Person.
Preamble: A Lawyer's Responsibilities.	4.4. Respect for Rights of Third Persons.
Scope.	LAW FIRMS AND ASSOCIATIONS
CLIENT-LAWYER RELATIONSHIP	5.1. Responsibilities of a Partner or Supervisory Lawyer.
1.1. Competence.	5.2. Responsibilities of a Subordinate Lawyer.
1.2. Scope of Representation.	5.3. Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants.
1.3. Diligence.	5.4. Professional Independence of a Lawyer.
1.4. Communication.	5.5. Unauthorized Practice Of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice Of Law.
1.5. Fees.	5.6. Restrictions on Right to Practice.
1.6. Confidentiality of Information.	5.7. Responsibilities Regarding Law-Related Services.
1.7. Conflict of Interest: General Rule.	PUBLIC SERVICE
1.8. Conflict of Interest: Prohibited Transactions.	6.1. Voluntary Pro Bono Publico Service.
1.9. Conflict of Interest: Former Client.	6.2. Accepting Appointments.
1.10. Imputed Disqualification: General Rule.	6.3. Membership in Legal Services Organization.
1.11. Successive Government and Private Employment.	6.4. Law Reform Activities Affecting Client Interests.
1.12. Former Judge or Arbitrator.	6.5. Nonprofit and Court-Annexed Limited Legal Services Programs.
1.13. Organization as Client.	INFORMATION ABOUT LEGAL SERVICES
1.14. Client With Diminished Capacity.	7.1. Communications Concerning a Lawyer's Services.
1.15. Safekeeping Property.	7.2. Advertising.
1.16. Declining or Terminating Representation.	7.3. Solicitation of Professional Employment.
1.17. Sale of Law Practice.	7.4. Communication of Fields of Practice.
COUNSELOR	7.5. Firm Names and Letterheads.
2.1. Advisor.	MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE PROFESSION
2.2. Intermediary [Reserved].	8.1. Bar Admission and Disciplinary Matters.
2.3. Evaluation for Use by Third Persons.	8.2. Judicial and Legal Officials.
2.4. Lawyer Serving As Third-Party Neutral.	8.3. Reporting Professional Misconduct.
ADVOCATE	8.4. Misconduct.
3.1. Meritorious Claims and Contentions.	8.5. Disciplinary Authority; Choice of Law.
3.2. Expediting Litigation.	DEFINITIONS; TITLE
3.3. Candor Toward the Tribunal.	9.1. Definitions.
3.4. Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel.	9.2. Title.
3.5. Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal.	IOLTA GUIDELINES
3.6. Trial Publicity.	IOLTA Guidelines.
3.7. Lawyer As Witness.	Appendix A. Attorney's Notice of Enrollment.
3.8. Special Responsibilities of A Prosecutor.	
3.9. Advocate in Nonadjudicative Proceedings.	
TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS OTHER THAN CLIENTS	
4.1. Truthfulness in Statements to Others.	
4.2. Communication with Person Represented by Counsel.	

Rule 3:09, the Code of Judicial Conduct, with which an advocate should be familiar. A lawyer is required to avoid contributing to a violation of such provisions.

[2] The advocate's function is to present evidence and argument so that the cause may be decided according to law. Refraining from abusive or obstreperous conduct is a corollary of the advocate's right to speak on behalf of litigants. A lawyer may stand firm against abuse by a judge but should avoid reciprocation; the judge's default is no justification for similar dereliction by an advocate. An advocate can present the cause, protect the record for subsequent review and preserve professional integrity by patient firmness no less effectively than by belligerence or theatrics.

Corresponding ABA Model Rule. Identical to Model Rule 3.5(a), (b) and (c); (d) added from DR 7-108(D).

Corresponding Former Massachusetts Rule. DR 7-106, DR 7-108(D), DR 7-110(B), S.J.C. Rule 3:08, PF 1, DF 1.

Rule 3.6. Trial Publicity

(a) A lawyer who is participating or has participated in the investigation or litigation of a matter shall not make an extrajudicial statement that a reasonable person would expect to be disseminated by means of public communication if the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that it will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding in the matter.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), a lawyer may state:

- (1) the claim, offense, or defense involved, and, except when prohibited by law, the identity of the persons involved;
- (2) the information contained in a public record;
- (3) that an investigation of the matter is in progress;
- (4) the scheduling or result of any step in litigation;
- (5) a request for assistance in obtaining evidence and information necessary thereto;
- (6) a warning of danger concerning the behavior of a person involved, when there is reason to believe that there exists the likelihood of substantial harm to an individual or to the public interest; and
- (7) in a criminal case, in addition to subparagraphs (1) through (6):
 - (i) the identity, residence, occupation, and family status of the accused;
 - (ii) if the accused has not been apprehended, information necessary to aid in apprehension of that person;
 - (iii) the fact, time, and place of arrest; and
 - (iv) the identity of investigating and arresting officers or agencies and the length of the investigation.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), a lawyer may make a statement that a reasonable lawyer would believe is required to protect a client from the sub-

stantial undue prejudicial effect of recent publicity not initiated by the lawyer or the lawyer's client. A statement made pursuant to this paragraph shall be limited to such information as is necessary to mitigate the recent adverse publicity.

(d) No lawyer associated in a firm or government agency with a lawyer subject to paragraph (a) shall make a statement prohibited by paragraph (a).

(e) This rule does not preclude a lawyer from replying to charges of misconduct publicly made against him or her or from participating in the proceedings of a legislative, administrative, or other investigative body.

Adopted June 9, 1997, effective January 1, 1998.

Comment

[1] It is difficult to strike a balance between protecting the right to a fair trial and safeguarding the right of free expression. Preserving the right to a fair trial necessarily entails some curtailment of the information that may be disseminated about a party prior to trial, particularly where trial by jury is involved. If there were no such limits, the result would be the practical nullification of the protective effect of the rules of forensic decorum and the exclusionary rules of evidence. On the other hand, there are vital social interests served by the free dissemination of information about events having legal consequences and about legal proceedings themselves. The public has a right to know about threats to its safety and measures aimed at assuring its security. It also has a legitimate interest in the conduct of judicial proceedings, particularly in matters of general public concern. Furthermore, the subject matter of legal proceedings is often of direct significance in debate and deliberation over questions of public policy.

[2] Special rules of confidentiality may validly govern proceedings in juvenile, domestic relations and mental disability proceedings, and perhaps other types of litigation. Rule 3.4(c) requires compliance with such rules.

[3] The Rule sets forth a basic general prohibition against a lawyer's making statements that the lawyer knows or should know will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding. Recognizing that the public value of informed commentary is great and the likelihood of prejudice to a proceeding by the commentary of a lawyer who is not involved in the proceeding is small, the rule applies only to lawyers who are, or who have been involved in the investigation or litigation of a case, and their associates.

[4] Paragraph (b) identifies specific matters about which a lawyer's statements would not ordinarily be considered to present a substantial likelihood of material prejudice, and should not in any event be considered prohibited by the general prohibition of paragraph (a). Paragraph (b) is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of the subjects upon which a lawyer may make a statement, but statements on other matters may be subject to paragraph (a).

[5] There are, on the other hand, certain subjects which are more likely than not to have a material prejudicial effect on a proceeding, particularly when they refer to a civil matter triable to a jury, a criminal matter, or any other proceeding that could result in incarceration. These subjects relate to:

(1) the character, credibility, reputation or criminal record of a party, suspect in a criminal investigation or witness, or the identity of a witness, or the expected testimony of a party or witness;

(2) in a criminal case or proceeding that could result in incarceration, the possibility of a plea of guilty to the offense or the existence or contents of any confession, admission, or statement given by a defendant or suspect or that person's refusal or failure to make a statement;

(3) the performance or results of any examination or test or the refusal or failure of a person to submit to an examination or test, or the identity or nature of physical evidence expected to be presented;

(4) any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of a defendant or suspect in a criminal case or proceeding that could result in incarceration;

(5) information that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know is likely to be inadmissible as evidence in a trial and that would, if disclosed, create a substantial risk of prejudicing an impartial trial; or

(6) the fact that a defendant has been charged with a crime, unless there is included therein a statement explaining that the charge is merely an accusation and that the defendant is presumed innocent until and unless proven guilty.

[6] Another relevant factor in determining prejudice is the nature of the proceeding involved. Criminal jury trials will be most sensitive to extrajudicial speech. Civil trials may be less sensitive. Non-jury hearings and arbitration proceedings may be even less affected. The Rule will still place limitations on prejudicial comments in these cases, but the likelihood of prejudice may be different depending on the type of proceeding.

[7] Finally, extrajudicial statements that might otherwise raise a question under this Rule may be permissible when they are made in response to statements made publicly by another party, another party's lawyer, or third persons, where a reasonable lawyer would believe a public response is required in order to avoid prejudice to the lawyer's client. When prejudicial statements have been publicly made by others, responsive statements may have the salutary effect of lessening any resulting adverse impact on the adjudicative proceeding. Such responsive statements should be limited to contain only such information as is necessary to mitigate undue prejudice created by the statements made by others.

Corresponding ABA Model Rule. Almost identical to Model Rule 3.6 except paragraph (e) is derived from DR 7-107(I).

Corresponding Former Massachusetts Rule. DR 7-107.

Rule 3.7. Lawyer As Witness

(a) A lawyer shall not act as advocate at a trial in which the lawyer is likely to be a necessary witness except where:

- (1) the testimony relates to an uncontested issue;
- (2) the testimony relates to the nature and value of legal services rendered in the case; or
- (3) disqualification of the lawyer would work substantial hardship on the client.

(b) A lawyer may act as advocate in a trial in which another lawyer in the lawyer's firm is likely to be

called as a witness unless precluded from doing so by Rule 1.7 or Rule 1.9.

Adopted June 9, 1997, effective January 1, 1998.

Comment

[1] Combining the roles of advocate and witness can prejudice the opposing party and can involve a conflict of interest between the lawyer and client.

[2] The opposing party has proper objection where the combination of roles may prejudice that party's rights in the litigation. A witness is required to testify on the basis of personal knowledge, while an advocate is expected to explain and comment on evidence given by others. It may not be clear whether a statement by an advocate-witness should be taken as proof or as an analysis of the proof.

[3] Paragraph (a)(1) recognizes that if the testimony will be uncontested, the ambiguities in the dual role are purely theoretical. Paragraph (a)(2) recognizes that where the testimony concerns the extent and value of legal services rendered in the action in which the testimony is offered, permitting the lawyers to testify avoids the need for a second trial with new counsel to resolve that issue. Moreover, in such a situation the judge has firsthand knowledge of the matter in issue; hence, there is less dependence on the adversary process to test the credibility of the testimony.

[4] Apart from these two exceptions, paragraph (a)(3) recognizes that a balancing is required between the interests of the client and those of the opposing party. Whether the opposing party is likely to suffer prejudice depends on the nature of the case, the importance and probable tenor of the lawyer's testimony, and the probability that the lawyer's testimony will conflict with that of other witnesses. Even if there is risk of such prejudice, in determining whether the lawyer should be disqualified, due regard must be given to the effect of disqualification on the lawyer's client. It is relevant that one or both parties could reasonably foresee that the lawyer would probably be a witness. The principle of imputed disqualification stated in Rule 1.10 has no application to this aspect of the problem.

[5] Whether the combination of roles involves an improper conflict of interest with respect to the client is determined by Rule 1.7 or 1.9. For example, if there is likely to be substantial conflict between the testimony of the client and that of the lawyer or a member of the lawyer's firm, the representation is improper. The problem can arise whether the lawyer is called as a witness on behalf of the client or is called by the opposing party. Determining whether or not such a conflict exists is primarily the responsibility of the lawyer involved. See Comment to Rule 1.7. If a lawyer who is a member of a firm may not act as both advocate and witness by reason of conflict of interest, Rule 1.10 disqualifies the firm also.

Corresponding ABA Model Rule. Identical to Model Rule 3.7.

Corresponding Former Massachusetts Rule. DR 5-101(B), DR 5-102(A).

Rule 3.8. Special Responsibilities of A Prosecutor

The prosecutor in a criminal case shall:

- (a) refrain from prosecuting a charge that the prosecutor knows is not supported by probable cause;