LIONEL SAWYER & COLLINS

SAMUEL S. LIONEL GRANT SAWYER (1918-1996)

JON R. COLLINS (1923-1987)

RICHARD H. BRYAN
JEFFREY P. ZUCKER
PAUL R. HEJMANOWSKI
ROBERT D. FAISS
DAVID N. FREDERICK
RODNEY M. JEAN
HARVEY WHITTEMORE
TODD TOUTON
CAM FERENBACH
LYNDA S. MABRY
MARK H. GOLDSTEIN
KIRBY J. SMITH
COLLEEN A. DOLAN
JENNIFER A. SMITH
DAN R. REASER
PAUL E. LARSEN

ALLEN J. WILT LYNN S. FULSTONE RORY J. REID DAN C. McGUIRE JOHN E. DAWSON FRED D. "PETE" GIBSON, III CHARLES H. McCREA JR GREGORY E. SMITH MALANI L. KOTCHKA LESLIE BRYAN HART CRAIG E. ETEM TODD F KENNEDY MATTHEW E. WATSON JOHN M. NAYLOR WILLIAM J. McKEAN ELIZABETH BRICKFIELD GREGORY R. GEMIGNANI LINDA M. BULLEN LAURA J. THALACKER DOREEN SPEARS HARTWELL LAURA K. GRANIER MAXIMILIANO D. COUVILLIER III ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1700 BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

300 SOUTH FOURTH STREET

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

(702) 383-8888

FAX (702) 383-8845

lsc@tionelsawyer.com

www.lionelsawyer.com

June 11, 2010

MICHAEL D. KNOX
ERIN FLYNN
JENNIFER ROBERTS
MEREDITH L. MARKWELL
DOUGLAS A. CANNON
RICHARD T. CUNNINGHAM
MATTHEW R. POLICASTRO
JENNIFER J. DIMARZIO
PEARL L. GALLAGHER
CHRISTINE D. SMITH
SUSAN L. MYERS
BRIAN S. PICK
JENNIFER L. BRASTERLUCAS J. TUCKER
CHRISTOPHER WALTHER
KEVIN J. HEJMANOWSKI

KETAN D. BHIRUD
LAUREN D. CALVERT-ARNOLD
ROBERT W. HERNQUIST
CHRISTIAN HALE
TIMOTHY R. MULLINER
COURTINEY MILLER O'MARA
BRIAN H. SCHUSTERMAN
MOHAMED A. IOBAL, JR.
KELLY R. KICHLINE
MARK J. GARDBERG
ELIZABETH A. HICH
JAMES B. GIBSON
GREG J. CARLSON
ABIGAYLE F. DANG
JING ZHAO
JOHN D. TENNERT

OF COUNSEL
A. WILLIAM MAUPIN
RICHARD J. MORGAN*
ELLEN WHITTEMORE
CHRISTOPHER MATHEWS
MARK A. CLAYTON

*ADMITTED IN CA ONLY

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER (702) 383-8916 RBRY AN@LIONELSAWYER.COM

The Honorable Chief Justice Ron D. Parraguirre Supreme Court of the State of Nevada 201 S. Carson Street, Ste. 250 Carson City, NV 89701-4702

Dear Chief Justice Parraguirre:

ADKT 445

FLED

JUN 15 2010

CLERY OF BURBENE OF RIT

I am writing regarding comments to changes in Rule 7.3 which the Court is contemplating. I apologize for the lateness of this communication, but I only recently learned of this development and Rule 7.3 has been a topic of significant interest both to myself and my firm.

As the public hearing notice mentions, the goals of Rules 7.2 and 7.3 are to prevent false, misleading or deceptive solicitations or advertisements and to do so in a way that is consistent with First Amendment protections for commercial speech.

A year or so ago I drafted a letter welcoming a new business to the community and indicating our firm would be happy to assist if they needed local counsel. As a precaution I asked Cam Ferenbach to review the proposed letter. He did so and inquired of the State Bar counsel and was informed such a letter would have to contain a notice required by Rule 7.3; "NOTICE THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!" The advice seemed absurd, as nothing in the letter was either "misleading or deceptive." My understanding is that is the purpose of the rule.

The proposed changes to Rule 7.3 address legibility of mandatory notices and the use of mandatory notices in e-mail communications. However, it is the blanket application of the mandatory notices that is my primary concern.

G:\Attomeys\RHB\Chief Justice letter 6 144-0 re Rule V.3.doc

RENO OFFICE: 1100 BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA, 50 WEST LIBERTY STREET + RENO, NEVADA 89501 + (775) 788-8666 + FAX (775) 788-8682

TRACIE K LINGSMANY OFFICE 410 SOUTH CARSON STREET - CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701 - (775) 851-2115 - FAX (775) 841-2119
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

10-34250



The Honorable Chief Justice Ron D. Parraguirre June 11, 2010 Page 2

Based upon the advice received and by logical extension the following scenarios would likewise require the "NOTICE THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!" legend:

A new lawyer joins a Nevada law firm. The lawyer attends a Chamber of Commerce meeting and, consistent with the customs of such meetings, hands out business cards to individuals who are not currently clients, introducing herself and telling the people to whom the lawyer gives her business card that she would appreciate being able to assist them if they have legal needs. The business cards are written, but do not contain the notice "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!".

An old law school friend of a local intellectual property attorney is promoted to General Counsel of a local gaming business. As a courtesy, the local intellectual property attorney sends his old friend a professional congratulatory letter. The local gaming business is not a client of the local intellectual property attorney, but may find the local intellectual property attorney's services useful. The letter does not contain the notice: "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!"

A new business opens in town. A lawyer sees the notice and sends a welcome letter to welcome the new business to the community. The letter is in the form of a written communication that does not contain the notice "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!"

After giving a presentation regarding a particular area of the law to a local trade association, as part of the presentation, the lawyer provides printed handouts containing the slides from the presentation. The handout does not contain the notice "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!"

A new law is enacted that is likely to impact employers in the state. A law firm decides to offer a briefing regarding the new law that is set to take effect. To let business owners know of the presentation, the firm sends an invitation and summary to those on its e-mailing list. The list contains current, past and prospective clients who have subscribed to the list. The e-mail notice of the presentation and summary does not begin with the notation "ATTORNEY ADVERTISING:"

Clearly, as professionals with unique access to the courts and experience in representing the public, we should hold ourselves to the highest standards to ensure that we maintain the public trust while preserving the integrity of the profession. Unfortunately, some in our profession have chosen to operate in a manner that does not comport with these stated goals. In response to such questionable behavior, we have adopted rules to promote these noble goals that are only loosely related to the goals and may actually further erode the image of the profession. For example, sending a professional congratulatory letter to non-client



The Honorable Chief Justice Ron D. Parraguirre June 11, 2010
Page 3

acquaintance with the notice "NOTICE: THIS IS AN ADVERTISEMENT!" may not only be viewed by the recipient as bizarre, but it may also be offensive.

As you review the proposed changes to Rule 7.3, please consider tailoring the Rule to address the problems that the Rule was intended to correct. There should be some nexus between the required notice and the content and circumstances of the communication.

Sincerely,

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

G:\Attorneys\RHB\Chief Justice letter 6 11 10 re Rule 7.3.doc