IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FILED

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDMENTS TO NEVADA RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT: RPC 7.2, RPC 7.2a, RPC 7.3

ADKT 0445

JAN 27 2012

CHIE DEPUTY CLERK

STATE BAR'S COMMENTS TO THE COURT'S ORDER OF DECEMBER 8, 2011

Pursuant to the Court's Order of December 8, 2011, the State Bar of Nevada ("Board") hereby submits its written comments to Richard H. Bryan's letter dated June 10, 2010.

The State Bar's Southern and Northern Lawyer Advertising Advisory Committees ("Committees") reviewed the letter from Richard H. Bryan concerning potential rule changes proposed in ADKT 445 at each of their respective meetings in January, 2011, and provided input to the Board to address the concerns that Mr. Bryan has in regards to Rule of Professional Conduct ("RPC") 7.3(c) Communication With Prospective Clients.

RPC 7.3(c) states:

Direct or indirect mail envelope, and written mail communications or advertising circulars shall contain, upon the outside of the envelope and upon the communication side of each page of the communication or advertisement, in legible type that is at least as twice as large as the largest type used in the body of the communication, in red ink, the following warning:

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. Bryan provided several examples in his letter of instances in which he believed the disclaimer required by RPC 7.3(c) would be necessary but also overly burdensome. The first example is of an attorney handing out business cards during a Chamber of Commerce meeting. Mr. Bryan indicates that RPC 7.3(c) would require that the business card contain the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT."



-1-

12-03001

20 21

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

20

24

25

The Committees do not agree with this conclusion. While the business card is a written communication it does not fall under the purview of RPC 7.3(c) because it is neither mailed or a type of circular. Also, the participants of a Chamber of Commerce meeting are aware that it is a networking opportunity and are inviting the opportunity to learn about new business services including legal services. As such, the concerns addressed by RPC 7.3(c) are not implicated in this example.

The second example is of an attorney sending another attorney, who is also a personal friend, a congratulatory letter for receiving a new position as General Counsel to a local gaming business. While the letter is congratulatory only, the General Counsel may wish to use the sender's legal services in the future. Mr. Bryan indicates that RPC 7.3(c) would require that the congratulatory letter contain the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT."

The Committees do not agree with this conclusion. The Advertising Committee Rules ("ACR"), as enacted by the Board of Governors per RPC 7.2B in ACR 2(o)(1)(h), define as exempt:

Listings in a regularly published law list; newsletters or other similar publications directed primarily to other lawyers and legal professionals; and announcements limited to change of address, affiliation, or staffing are exempt from filing.

The Committees agreed that this rule exempts written communications between attorneys. They would regard a congratulatory letter from one attorney to another as being exempt from filing and the requirement of the RPC 7.3(c) disclaimer. The Committees suggest that the ACR definition be broadened to include this type of communication. Further, the Committees feel that the scope of RPC 7.3(c) is to protect prospective clients and not to govern communication between attorneys.

The third example is of an attorney sending a welcome letter to a new business in town. Mr. Bryan indicates that RPC 7.3(c) would require that the welcome letter contain the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT."

The Committees agree with this conclusion. Because the letter is a written communication which is mailed to an individual who is a prospective client and is not an attorney, it falls under the purview of RPC 7.3(c). The Committees believe that the purpose of the welcome letter is to introduce the new business to the legal services of the attorney and that "a significant motive for the lawyer's doing so is the lawyer's pecuniary gain" as stated in RPC 7.3(a). In this example, the welcome letter would need the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT" printed in red on the envelope as well as upon each page of the communication.

The fourth example is of an attorney providing a printed handout of slides from a presentation to a local trade group. Mr. Bryan indicates that RPC 7.3(c) would require that the handout contain the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT."

The Committees do not agree with this conclusion. While the handout is a written communication it does not fall under the purview of RPC 7.3(c) because it is neither mailed or a type of circular. Further, in the instance of a presentation, the attendees of the presentation have opted to be present and to receive the information. The Committees did conclude that any advertisement for the presentation mailed to prospective participants would need the disclaimer.

The final example is of an e-mail solicitation for a presentation that is sent to current, past and prospective clients who subscribe to a firm's e-mail list. Mr. Bryan indicates that RPC 7.3(c) would require that the e-mail contain the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT."

The Committees do not agree with this conclusion. Because the recipients of this e-mail have subscribed to be on the firm's e-mail list, they have opted to receive information from this firm. If the recipients of the e-mail had not subscribed to the list, the Committees conclude that the e-mail would need the disclaimer, "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT" in the subject line of the e-mail. The Committees note that this "subject line" requirement is one of the proposed rule changes in ADKT 445.

The Committees believe that RPC 7.3(c) serves to inform the public that they are being exposed to an advertisement rather than a legal document requiring their attention. The Office of Bar Counsel has told the Committees about instances of the public being frightened by receiving attorney advertisements in the form of letters which they believed to be legal documents. In at least one instance, an elderly woman who had previously received a notice of default was frightened to open an envelope which had an attorney's return address on it but with no disclaimer. The woman believed she was being sued and called her husband to come home from work. It wasn't until after he opened the letter that they realized it was an advertisement. It is to prevent this type of scenario that RPC 7.3(c) requires a clearly visible disclaimer on the envelope and upon each page of the communication.

We hope that these comments assist the judicial panel in their consideration of ADKT 445.

Respectfully submitted this 24 day of January, 2012.

STATE BAR OF NEVADA BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Constance L. Akridge, Presiden

Nevada Bar No. 3353

3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 3rd Floor South

Las Vegas, NV 89169

(702) 862-3300

STATE BAR OF NEVADA

January 25, 2012

Chief Justice Nancy Saitta Nevada Supreme Court 201 South Carson Street Carson City NV 89701-4702

RE:

ADKT 0445

Dear Chief Justice Saitta:

An Order seeking state bar comments to ADKT 0445 was filed in the Supreme Court on December 8, 2011.

On behalf of the Board of Governors I am pleased to submit to the Court the attached petition with respect to ADKT 0445. I am available to provide further information to the Court as requested.

Respectfully,

Kimberly K. Farmer

Simbergl

Executive Director

cc:

Connie Akridge, President

Tracie Lindeman

Enclosure



600 East Charleston Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89104-1563 phone 702.382.2200 toll free 800.254.2797 fax 702.385.2878

9456 Double R Blvd., Ste. B Reno, NV 89521-5977 phone 775.329.4100 fax 775.329.0522

www.nvbar.org

