

1 The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of  
2 Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as  
3 representing the policy of the American Bar Association.

4  
5 **American Bar Association**  
6 **Commission on Ethics 20/20**  
7 **Resolution**  
8

9 **RESOLVED: That the American Bar Association adopts amendments to the ABA**  
10 ***Model Rule for Admission by Motion*, dated August 2012, as follows (additions**  
11 **underlined, deletions ~~struck through~~):**  
12

13 **ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion**  
14

- 15 1. An applicant who meets the requirements of (a) through (g) of this Rule may, upon  
16 motion, be admitted to the practice of law in this jurisdiction. The applicant shall:  
17
- 18 (a) have been admitted to practice law in another state, territory, or the District of  
19 Columbia and currently hold an active license to practice law in at least one  
20 state, territory or the District of Columbia;
  - 21 (b) hold a J.D. or LL.B. degree from a law school approved by the Council of the  
22 Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar  
23 Association at the time the applicant matriculated or graduated;
  - 24 (c) have been primarily engaged in the active practice of law in one or more  
25 states, territories or the District of Columbia for ~~five~~ [three] of the ~~[seven]~~  
26 years immediately preceding the date upon which the application is filed;
  - 27 (d) establish that the applicant is currently a member in good standing in all  
28 jurisdictions where admitted;
  - 29 (e) establish that the applicant is not currently subject to lawyer discipline or the  
30 subject of a pending disciplinary matter in any jurisdiction;
  - 31 (f) establish that the applicant possesses the character and fitness to practice law  
32 in this jurisdiction; and
  - 33 (g) designate the Clerk of the jurisdiction’s highest court for service of process.  
34
- 35 2. For purposes of this ~~¶~~Rule, the “active practice of law” shall include the following  
36 activities, if performed in a jurisdiction in which the applicant is admitted and  
37 authorized to practice, or if performed in a jurisdiction that affirmatively permits such  
38 activity by a lawyer not admitted in that jurisdiction; however, in no event shall any  
39 activities that were performed in advance of bar admission in some state, territory, or  
40 the District of Columbia be accepted toward the durational requirement:  
41
- 42 (a) Representation of one or more clients in the private practice of law;
  - 43 (b) Service as a lawyer with a local, state, territorial or federal agency, including  
44 military service;
  - 45 (c) Teaching law at a law school approved by the Council of the Section of Legal  
46 Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association;

- 47 (d) Service as a judge in a federal, state, territorial or local court of record;
- 48 (e) Service as a judicial law clerk; or
- 49 (f) Service as in-house counsel provided to the lawyer’s employer or its
- 50 organizational affiliates.

51

52 3. For purposes of this ~~¶~~Rule, the active practice of law shall not include work that, as

53 undertaken, constituted the unauthorized practice of law in the jurisdiction in which it

54 was performed or in the jurisdiction in which the clients receiving the unauthorized

55 services were located.

56

57 4. An applicant who has failed a bar examination administered in this jurisdiction within

58 five years of the date of filing an application under this ~~¶~~Rule shall not be eligible for

59 admission on motion.

60

61 **FURTHER RESOLVED**, That the American Bar Association urges jurisdictions that

62 have not adopted the Model Rule on Admission by Motion to do so and urges

63 jurisdictions that have adopted admission by motion procedures to eliminate any

64 restrictions that do not appear in the Model Rule on Admission by Motion.

**The views expressed herein have not been approved by the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Bar Association.**

## REPORT

The ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20 has examined many ways in which globalization and technology have affected the legal profession, including the increasing importance of cross-border practice. In particular, the Commission has examined the existing regulatory framework governing multijurisdictional practice and lawyer mobility and has produced several related Resolutions and Reports.<sup>1</sup> The Resolution accompanying this Report concerns an amendment to the ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion that is intended to allow lawyers to qualify for admission by motion at an earlier point in their careers than the current Rule allows.

To develop appropriate recommendations in this area, the Commission's Uniformity, Choice of Law, and Conflicts of Interest Working Group included participants from the Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, the Standing Committee on Client Protection, the Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, and the National Organization of Bar Counsel. They made important contributions to the Working Group's understanding of the issues and the development of the Resolutions accompanying this Report.

The Commission also benefited greatly from the efforts of the ABA Commission on Multijurisdictional Practice ("MJP Commission"), which completed its work nearly a decade ago. In August 2002, the ABA House of Delegates adopted as Association policy all nine of the MJP Commission's recommendations,<sup>2</sup> which reflected a more permissive regulatory framework. This framework allowed lawyers, subject to certain limitations, to practice law on a temporary basis in jurisdictions in which they were not otherwise authorized to practice law.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the framework included mechanisms that allowed lawyers, sometimes with limitations, to establish an ongoing practice in a jurisdiction in which they were not otherwise authorized and without the necessity of sitting for a written bar examination.<sup>4</sup> The Commission has found that this framework

---

<sup>1</sup> In one Resolution, the Commission is recommending changes to ABA Model Rule 5.5 that would allow lawyers to establish a systematic and continuous presence in another jurisdiction while diligently pursuing admission in that jurisdiction. Other Resolutions recommend amendments to existing ABA Model Rules to address distinct issues associated with inbound foreign lawyers. Finally, the Commission is recommending changes to Model Rule 1.6 that would clarify a lawyer's confidentiality obligations when a lawyer is asked, as part of a lateral hiring process, to provide a firm with information about current and former clients in order to permit the firm to determine if any conflicts would arise from the lawyer's association with the firm.

<sup>2</sup> See *Client Representation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Report of the Commission on Multijurisdictional Practice (2002).

[http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/committees\\_commissions/commission\\_on\\_multijurisdictional\\_practice.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/committees_commissions/commission_on_multijurisdictional_practice.html)

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 5.5(c); ABA Model Rule for Pro Hac Vice Admission.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 5.5(d); ABA Model Rule for Admission by Motion.

has been widely adopted<sup>5</sup> and that it has enabled lawyers to represent their clients more effectively and efficiently, provided clients with more freedom regarding their choice of counsel, and afforded lawyers more personal and professional flexibility.

The current framework has served lawyers and clients well, but the Commission concluded that additional changes are necessary in light of technological developments, economic trends, and client needs and demands. As noted above, this Report describes proposed changes to the Model Rule on Admission by Motion.

The Commission found that, during the last five years, more than 40,000 lawyers already admitted in one jurisdiction sought admission by motion or sat for the bar examination in another jurisdiction.<sup>6</sup> In light of this continuing and significant need for admission in another jurisdiction, the Commission is recommending an amendment to the ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion that would enable lawyers to qualify for admission by motion at an earlier point in their careers than the current Rule allows (i.e., after three years of practice rather than five). The Commission is also asking that the ABA adopt a resolution urging jurisdictions that have not adopted the Model Rule to do so and, in particular, to do so without imposing additional restrictions, such as reciprocity requirements.

## **I. History of the ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion**

In August 2002, the ABA House of Delegates adopted the Model Rule on Admission by Motion. The Model Rule permits a lawyer admitted in one U.S. jurisdiction to gain full admission in another jurisdiction without having to pass that jurisdiction's bar examination. The lawyer, however, must satisfy several requirements, one of which is to have engaged in the active practice of law for five of the last seven years.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Since August 2002, forty-four jurisdictions have adopted some form of multijurisdictional practice that is similar to Model Rule 5.5. Chart, State Implementation of ABA Model Rule 5.5 (October 27, 2010). [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/quick\\_guide\\_5\\_5.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/quick_guide_5_5.authcheckdam.pdf). Every jurisdiction now has a rule allowing for pro hac vice admission. Chart, Comparison of ABA Model Rule For Pro Hac Vice Admission With State Versions and amendments since August 2002 (May 12, 2011). [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/prohac\\_admin\\_comp.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/prohac_admin_comp.authcheckdam.pdf). Seven jurisdictions have adopted a version of the ABA Model Rule for Temporary Practice by Foreign Lawyers.

[http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/8\\_and\\_9\\_status\\_chart.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/8_and_9_status_chart.authcheckdam.pdf). Forty jurisdictions have adopted a version of the ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion. Chart, Comparison of ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion With State Versions (March 11, 2011). [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission\\_motion\\_comp.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission_motion_comp.authcheckdam.pdf)

Finally, thirty-one jurisdictions have adopted a version of the Model Rule for the Licensing and Practice of Foreign Legal Consultants. Chart, Foreign Legal Consultant Rules (December 21, 2010). [http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/for\\_legal\\_consultants.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/for_legal_consultants.authcheckdam.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar\\_Admissions/2010\\_Stats.pdf](http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar_Admissions/2010_Stats.pdf) (pp. 21, 28).

<sup>7</sup> The Model Rule has remained unchanged except for one amendment in 2011. In February 2011, the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar filed a Resolution with the House of Delegates recommending that the Model Rule be amended to eliminate a provision that prohibited a lawyer's work as in-house counsel or as a judicial law clerk from being counted as part of the necessary practice experience to qualify for admission by motion. The House agreed that the Model Rule had created "an unfair and unnecessary distinction" between in-house counsel

Admission by motion procedures now exist in forty jurisdictions. The Commission's research revealed that more than 65,000 lawyers have used the procedure in the last ten years.<sup>8</sup> The Commission also found that there is no evidence that lawyers admitted by motion are more likely to be subject to discipline, disciplinary complaints, or malpractice suits than lawyers admitted through more traditional procedures. The Commission sought information in this regard from lawyer disciplinary counsel, and responses revealed that the admission by motion process has produced no discernible risks to clients or the public. It also has enabled lawyers to relocate with greater ease and given clients more freedom to select their lawyers.

## **II. Proposal to Amend the Model Rule on Admission by Motion**

In light of the Commission's findings and changes in the practice of law during the last decade, the Commission proposes to reduce the length-of-practice requirement in the Model Rule for Admission by Motion. The current Model Rule requires an applicant for admission by motion to have actively practiced in another jurisdiction for five out of the past seven years; the Commission's proposal would enable a lawyer to qualify for admission by motion after practicing in another jurisdiction for only three out of the past seven years.

Market and client demands in an increasingly borderless world are fueling the need for lawyers to gain admission in other jurisdictions. The Commission's proposal would address this need and thus benefit both lawyers and their clients. In particular, lawyers increasingly need to move to, or practice on a systematic and continuous basis in, another jurisdiction in order to serve clients who are relocating or who regularly do business in the jurisdiction in which motion admission is sought.

The proposal also recognizes that lawyers often need to move to new jurisdictions for a wide range of personal reasons, including the need to find employment. The Commission determined that a reduction of the active practice requirement from five to three years would have particularly salutary effects for relatively junior lawyers, who are most likely to need to move from one jurisdiction to another. The challenging legal marketplace for recent graduates only increases the likelihood that relatively junior lawyers will need to move to a new jurisdiction in search of employment.

In considering whether to propose these amendments, the Commission seriously considered several possible arguments against reducing the time-in-practice requirement of the Rule. First, the Commission considered the concern that a lawyer who has practiced for only three years may not be sufficiently competent to practice law in a new jurisdiction. The Commission, however, found no reason to believe that lawyers who have been engaged in the active practice of law for three of the last seven years will be any less able to practice law in a new jurisdiction than a law school graduate who

---

and judicial clerks, on the one hand, and the other categories of lawyers listed in paragraph 2 of the Model Rule on the other, and thus adopted the proposed amendment.

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar\\_Admissions/2010\\_Stats.pdf](http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar_Admissions/2010_Stats.pdf) (p. 28) and [http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar\\_Admissions/2005\\_Stats.pdf](http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Bar_Admissions/2005_Stats.pdf) (p. 35).

recently passed the bar examination in that jurisdiction. In fact, five jurisdictions already have a reduced duration-of-practice requirement of three years,<sup>9</sup> and none of those jurisdictions have reported any resulting problems.

The Commission also found unpersuasive the concern that passage of the bar examination is necessary to demonstrate knowledge of the law of the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is seeking admission. As explained above, more than 65,000 lawyers have obtained admission by motion in the last ten years, and there is no evidence from disciplinary counsel or any other source that these lawyers have been unable to practice competently in the new jurisdiction or have been unable to identify and understand aspects of the new jurisdiction's law that differ from the law of the jurisdiction where those lawyers were originally admitted.

The Commission also concluded that the "local law" concern falsely assumes that passage of the bar examination demonstrates competence in local law. In fact, the bar examinations in nearly half of all jurisdictions do not test any knowledge of local law.<sup>10</sup> And in jurisdictions that do test local law, the portion of the test dedicated to that material is typically so small that bar passage is unlikely to turn on it. In sum, the majority of bar examinations require either limited knowledge of local law or none at all, suggesting that passage of the bar examination offers no better evidence of a lawyer's understanding of local law than three years of practice in another jurisdiction. In fact, three years of practice in another jurisdiction may enable a lawyer to identify and understand variations in the law more easily than a recent law school graduate who has never practiced at all but has passed the jurisdiction's bar examination.

Another possible concern that the Commission considered is that lawyers might take and pass the bar examination in a jurisdiction with a relatively high passage rate and then seek admission by motion in a jurisdiction that has more demanding examination requirements. The Commission concluded, however, that the three year waiting period is sufficiently long that lawyers would not have an incentive to circumvent the bar examination requirements of a jurisdiction with a relatively low bar pass rate. Lawyers who intend to practice in a jurisdiction with a bar examination that is difficult to pass are not likely to defer the start of their careers in that jurisdiction for three years in order to take advantage of an admission by motion procedure.

Finally, the Commission considered reducing from seven to five years the time within which the lawyer must fulfill the three year practice requirement. The Commission concluded, however, that the career tracks of modern lawyers are not always linear and that lawyers, both male and female, frequently need to take time away from the practice of law due to changes in personal circumstances, including changes in substantive employment, military service, returning to school for another degree or, an

---

<sup>9</sup>[http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission\\_motion\\_comp.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission_motion_comp.authcheckdam.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Nat'l Conference of Bar Exam'rs & Am. Bar Ass'n Section of Legal Education & Admissions to the Bar, Comprehensive Guide to Bar Admission Requirements 2011, at 32-34 (available at [http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Comp\\_Guide/2011\\_CompGuide.pdf](http://www.ncbex.org/fileadmin/mediafiles/downloads/Comp_Guide/2011_CompGuide.pdf))

issue that continues to disproportionately affect women, family care. The Commission therefore determined that a lawyer seeking admission by motion should be able to fulfill the three year practice requirement within the existing seven year time period and still qualify for admission by motion.

In sum, the Commission determined that, in most jurisdictions, a lengthy practice requirement unnecessarily hinders the lawyer mobility that clients and those who employ lawyers increasingly demand. The Commission nevertheless recognized that some jurisdictions may have particular needs that warrant a longer or shorter durational requirement. Thus, the Commission has placed the new durational practice requirement in brackets, along with the existing seven year time horizon within which the lawyer must satisfy the durational practice requirement. These brackets reflect the Commission's view that jurisdictions face a diversity of issues and concerns relating to bar admission and may need to tailor these requirements accordingly.

### **III. Implementation of ABA Model Rule on Admission by Motion Rule**

The Commission concluded that the widespread adoption of admission by motion procedures is a positive development, but the Commission also found that a number of jurisdictions have not yet adopted an admission by motion process or have adopted a process that imposes unnecessary restrictions and requirements. Thus, in addition to proposing the amendments described above, the Commission also urges the eleven jurisdictions that have not adopted the Model Rule to do so and urges jurisdictions with admission by motion procedures to eliminate any restrictions, such as reciprocity requirements, that do not appear in the Model Rule.

With regard to the eleven jurisdictions that have not adopted any admission by motion procedure, those jurisdictions require lawyers to take at least some portion of the jurisdiction's bar examination (or a special lawyers' examination) in order to gain admission. The Commission concluded that such a requirement is unnecessary for lawyers who have three years of experience and that these jurisdictions should adopt an admission by motion procedure.

With regard to the forty jurisdictions that have adopted an admission by motion procedure, ten have an admission by motion procedure that is nearly identical to the Model Rule.<sup>11</sup> The other thirty jurisdictions, however, have procedures that impose restrictions beyond those contained in the Model Rule and which the Commission believes are unduly restrictive and limit the goals of motion admission. More than half of these jurisdictions have some type of reciprocity requirement, which makes admission by motion possible only for lawyers from states that also offer admission by motion on a reciprocal basis.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, some jurisdictions have a more narrow definition than the Model Rule of the type of practice experiences that qualify a lawyer for admission by

---

<sup>11</sup> A comparison chart is available here:

[http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission\\_motion\\_comp.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/cpr/mjp/admission_motion_comp.authcheckdam.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

motion.<sup>13</sup> Other jurisdictions require lawyers to certify that they intend to practice actively and maintain an office in the state where admission by motion is being sought.<sup>14</sup>

The Commission found no evidence that these additional requirements are related in any way to the competence of the applicants or the protection of the public. Indeed, jurisdictions that have adopted the Model Rule without any additional restrictions have reported no problems. The Commission believes that such varied additional restrictions only serve to sustain outdated and parochial purposes at a time when the relevance of borders to the competent practice of law has and will continue to erode. The Commission believes that the Model Rule on Admission by Motion ensures competent representation and amply protects the integrity of the bar.

### **Conclusion**

Continually evolving technology, client demands and a national (as well as global) legal services marketplace have fueled an increase in cross-border practice as well as a related need for lawyers to relocate to new jurisdictions. The proposal accompanying this Report is intended to permit lawyers to respond to these developments to the benefit of their clients, while providing adequate regulatory safeguards. Accordingly, the Commission respectfully requests that the House of Delegates adopt the proposed amendments set forth in the accompanying Resolution.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*