Rule 5.3 Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants
(Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018)

With respect to a nonlawyer employed or retained by or associated with a lawyer:

(a) a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses managerial authority in a law firm,* shall make reasonable* efforts to ensure that the firm* has in effect measures giving reasonable* assurance that the nonlawyer’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer;

(b) a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over the nonlawyer, whether or not an employee of the same law firm,* shall make reasonable* efforts to ensure that the person’s* conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer; and

(c) a lawyer shall be responsible for conduct of such a person* that would be a violation of these rules or the State Bar Act if engaged in by a lawyer if:

(1) the lawyer orders or, with knowledge of the relevant facts and of the specific conduct, ratifies the conduct involved; or

(2) the lawyer, individually or together with other lawyers, possesses managerial authority in the law firm* in which the person* is employed, or has direct supervisory authority over the person,* whether or not an employee of the same law firm,* and knows* of the conduct at a time when its consequences can be avoided or mitigated but fails to take reasonable* remedial action.

Comment

Lawyers often utilize nonlawyer personnel, including secretaries, investigators, law student interns, and paraprofessionals. Such assistants, whether employees or independent contractors, act for the lawyer in rendition of the lawyer’s professional services. A lawyer must give such assistants appropriate instruction and supervision concerning all ethical aspects of their employment. The measures employed in instructing and supervising nonlawyers should take account of the fact that they might not have legal training.
NEW RULE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 5.3
(See Former Rule 3-110 Discussion)
Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In connection with consideration of current rule 3-110 (Failing to Act Competently), the Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct (“Commission”) has reviewed and evaluated ABA Model Rules 5.1 (Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers), 5.2 (Responsibilities of a Subordinate Lawyer), and 5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants). The Commission also reviewed relevant California statutes, rules, and case law relating to the issues addressed by the proposed rules. Although these proposed rules have no direct counterpart in the current California rules, the concept of the duty to supervise is found in the first Discussion paragraph to current rule 3-110, which states: “The duties set forth in rule 3-110 include the duty to supervise the work of subordinate attorney and non-attorney employees or agents.” The result of this evaluation is proposed rules 5.1 (Responsibilities of Managerial and Supervisory Lawyers), 5.2 (Responsibilities of a Subordinate Lawyer), and 5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants).

Rule As Issued For 90-day Public Comment

The main issue considered when evaluating a lawyer’s duty to supervise was whether to adopt versions of ABA Model Rules 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3, or retain the duty to supervise only as an element of the duty of competence. The Commission concluded adopting these proposed rules provides important public protection and critical guidance to lawyers possessing managerial authority by more specifically describing a lawyer’s duty to supervise other lawyers (proposed rule 5.1) and non-lawyer personnel (proposed rule 5.3). Proposed rules 5.1 and 5.3 extend beyond the duty to supervise that is implicit in current rule 3-110 and include a duty on firm managers to have procedures and practices that foster ethical conduct within a law firm. Current rule 3-110 includes a duty to supervise but says nothing about the subordinate lawyer’s duties. Proposed rule 5.2 addresses this omission by stating a subordinate lawyer generally cannot defend a disciplinary charge by blaming the supervisor. Although California’s current rules have no equivalent to proposed rule 5.2, there appears to be no conflict with the proposed rule and current California law in that there is no known California authority that permits a subordinate lawyer to defend a disciplinary charge based on clearly improper directions from a senior lawyer.

The following is a summary of proposed rule 5.3 (Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants).\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The first Discussion paragraph to current rule 3-110 provides:


\(^2\) The Executive Summaries for proposed rules 5.1 and 5.2 are provided separately.
Proposed rule 5.3 adopts the substance of ABA Model Rule 5.3. Proposed rule 5.3 is very similar to proposed rule 5.1. The major difference is that proposed rule 5.3 applies to the supervision of nonlawyer assistants and other legal support services, whereas proposed rule 5.1 applies to the supervision of lawyers. Proposed rule 5.3(a) requires that managing lawyers make “reasonable efforts to ensure” the law firm has measures that provide reasonable assurance that a nonlawyer’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer. Paragraph (b) requires that a lawyer who directly supervises a nonlawyer make “reasonable efforts to ensure” the nonlawyer’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer, whether or not the nonlawyer is an employee of the same firm. Neither provision imposes vicarious liability. However, a lawyer will be responsible for the conduct of a nonlawyer under paragraph (c) if a lawyer either ordered or, with knowledge of the relevant facts and specific conduct, ratifies the conduct of the nonlawyer, ((c)(1)), or knowing of the misconduct, failed to take remedial action when there was still time to avoid or mitigate the consequences, ((c)(2)).

There is one comment to the rule. The comment states the policy underlying the rule and explains the lawyer’s obligation in complying with the rule.

**National Background – Adoption of Model Rule 5.3**

As California does not presently have a direct counterpart to Model Rule 5.3, this section reports on the adoption of the Model Rule in United States’ jurisdictions. The ABA Comparison Chart, entitled “Variations of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 5.3: Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants,” revised May 5, 2015, is available at:

- [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/mrpc_5_3.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/mrpc_5_3.pdf)

Thirty-four jurisdictions have adopted Model Rule 5.3 verbatim. Ten jurisdictions have adopted a slightly modified version of Model Rule 5.3. Six jurisdictions have adopted a version of the rule that is substantially different from Model Rule 5.3. Only one jurisdiction has not adopted a version Model Rule 5.3: California.

**Post-Public Comment Revisions**

After consideration of comments received in response to the initial 90-day public comment period, the Commission made no changes to the proposed rule and voted to recommend that the Board adopt the proposed rule.

The Board adopted proposed rule 5.3 at its November 17, 2016 meeting.

**Supreme Court Action (May 10, 2018)**

The Supreme Court approved the rule as modified by the Court to be effective November 1, 2018. An omitted asterisk for a defined term was added.
Rule 5.3 Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants
(Redline Comparison to the ABA Model Rule)

With respect to a nonlawyer employed or retained by or associated with a lawyer:

(a) a partner, and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that the person's conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer;

(b) a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over the nonlawyer, whether or not an employee of the same law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the person's conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer; and

(c) a lawyer shall be responsible for conduct of such a person that would be a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if engaged in by a lawyer if:

(1) the lawyer orders or, with the knowledge of the relevant facts and of the specific conduct, ratifies the conduct involved; or

(2) the lawyer is a partner or has comparable, individually or together with other lawyers, possesses managerial authority in the law firm in which the person is employed, or has direct supervisory authority over the person, whether or not an employee of the same law firm, and knows of the conduct at a time when its consequences can be avoided or mitigated but fails to take reasonable remedial action.

Comment

[1] Paragraph (a) requires lawyers with managerial authority within a law firm to make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that nonlawyers in the firm and nonlawyers outside the firm who work on firm matters act in a way compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer. See Comment [6] to Rule 1.1 (retaining lawyers outside the firm) and Comment [1] to Rule 5.1 (responsibilities with respect to lawyers within a firm). Paragraph (b) applies to lawyers who have supervisory authority over such nonlawyers within or outside the firm. Paragraph (c) specifies the circumstances in which a lawyer is responsible for the conduct of such nonlawyers within or outside the firm that would be a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if engaged in by a lawyer.

Nonlawyers Within the Firm

[2] Lawyers generally employ assistants in their practice, often utilizing nonlawyer personnel, including secretaries, investigators, law student interns, and paraprofessionals. Such assistants, whether employees or independent contractors, act
for the lawyer in rendition of the lawyer's professional services. A lawyer must give such assistants appropriate instruction and supervision concerning their ethical aspects of their employment, particularly regarding the obligation not to disclose information relating to representation of the client, and should be responsible for their work product. The measures employed in instructing and supervising nonlawyers should take account of the fact that they do not have legal training and are not subject to professional discipline.

Nonlawyers Outside the Firm

[3] A lawyer may use nonlawyers outside the firm to assist the lawyer in rendering legal services to the client. Examples include the retention of an investigative or paraprofessional service, hiring a document management company to create and maintain a database for complex litigation, sending client documents to a third party for printing or scanning, and using an Internet-based service to store client information. When using such services outside the firm, a lawyer must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the services are provided in a manner that is compatible with the lawyer’s professional obligations. The extent of this obligation will depend upon the circumstances, including the education, experience and reputation of the nonlawyer; the nature of the services involved; the terms of any arrangements concerning the protection of client information; and the legal and ethical environments of the jurisdictions in which the services will be performed, particularly with regard to confidentiality. See also Rules 1.1 (competence), 1.2 (allocation of authority), 1.4 (communication with client), 1.6 (confidentiality), 5.4(a) (professional independence of the lawyer), and 5.5(a) (unauthorized practice of law). When retaining or directing a nonlawyer outside the firm, a lawyer should communicate directions appropriate under the circumstances to give reasonable assurance that the nonlawyer’s conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.

[4] Where the client directs the selection of a particular nonlawyer service provider outside the firm, the lawyer ordinarily should agree with the client concerning the allocation of responsibility for monitoring as between the client and the lawyer. See Rule 1.2. When making such an allocation in a matter pending before a tribunal, lawyers and parties may have additional obligations that are a matter of law beyond the scope of these Rules.