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LEGEND (see back page for additional information)

Yellow shading = has a foreign legal consultant rule

= rule permits temporary practice by foreign lawyers (also known as FIFO or fly-in, fly-out)

= rule permits foreign pro hac vice admission

= rule permits foreign in-house counsel

= has had at least one foreign-educated applicant sit for a bar exam between 2010 and 2014.

See p. 2 for links, chart & data sources: the Nat’l Conference of Bar Examiners and the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility
Based on implementation information contained in charts prepared by the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility
*This document is regularly updated. You can find the most recent version online on this ABA webpage and my webpage: see http://tinyurl.com/laurelterrymap

There are five methods by which foreign lawyers might actively practice in the United States: 1) through a license that permits only limited practice, known as a foreign legal consultant rule [addressed in ABA MJP Report 201H]; 2) through a rule that permits temporary transactional work by foreign lawyers or arbitration or mediation [addressed in ABA MJP Report 201J]; 3) through a rule that permits foreign lawyers to apply for pro hac vice admission in which a court grants a lawyer to appear temporarily in ongoing litigation [ABA Resolution #107C (Feb. 2013)]; 4) through a rule that permits foreign lawyers to serve as foreign counsel for arbitration or mediation ([addressed in ABA MJP Report 201J]); and 5) through full admission as a regularly-licensed lawyer in a U.S. jurisdiction. (The ABA does not have a policy on Method #5 although there are a number of foreign lawyers admitted annually; information about state admission rules is available in NCBE’s annual COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO BAR ADMISSIONS. See also NCBE Statistics.) Links to the ABA policies appear in the chart below.

In 2015, the Conference of Chief Justices [CCJ] adopted a Resolution that urged states to adopt explicit policies on issues 1-4 and on the issue of “association.” (For a related map, see here). States that are considering whether to adopt rules regarding these five methods of foreign lawyer admission might want to consider the model provided in International Trade in Legal Services and Professional Regulation: A Framework for State Bars Based on the Georgia Experience, available at http://tinyurl.com/GAToolkit. The CCJ endorsed this “Toolkit” in 2014.

### Jurisdictions with FLC Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions with FLC Rules</th>
<th>Explicitly Permit Foreign Lawyer Temporary Practice</th>
<th>Jurisdictions that Permit Foreign Lawyer Pro Hac Vice</th>
<th>Jurisdictions that Permit Foreign In-House Counsel</th>
<th>Since 2010 has had a foreign-educated full-admission applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE</td>
<td>CO, DE, DC (Rule 49(c)(13) (RPC 5.5(d)), FL, GA, NH, NM (includes transactional matters), NY, OR, PA, VA</td>
<td>CO, DC (Rule 49), GA (Rule 4.4), IL, ME, MI, (Rule 8.126), NJ, NM, NY, ND, OH (Rule XII), OK (Art. II(5)), OR, PA, TX (Rule XIX), UT (appeal arbitration only). (Note: not on the CPR’s list. Cf. Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 40 with Rule 14-806), VA, WI</td>
<td>AZ (R. 38(a), CO (205.5), CT, DC, DE (Rule 55.1), GA, IL, IA, IN, KS, MA, MT, NH, NJ, NC, NY, ND, OR (allowed on a temporary basis under Rule 5.5(c); further study underway), TX, VA (Part 1A), WA, WI, WV</td>
<td>AL, AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IL, IA, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MO, NV, NH, NY, OH, OR, PA, RI, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA Model FLC Rule (2006)</td>
<td>ABA Model Rule for Temporary Practice by Foreign Lawyers</td>
<td>ABA Model Pro Hac Vice Rule</td>
<td>ABA Model Rule 5.5 (d) re Foreign In-House Counsel and Registration Rule</td>
<td>No ABA policy; Council did not act on Committee Proposal; see state rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA Commission on Multijurisdictional Practice web page</td>
<td>State Rules—Temporary Practice by Foreign Lawyers (ABA chart)</td>
<td>Comparison of ABA Model Rule for Pro Hac Vice Admission with State Versions and Amendments since August 2002 (ABA chart)</td>
<td>In-House Corporate Counsel Registration Rules (ABA chart); Comparison of ABA Model Rule for Registration of In-House Counsel with State Versions (ABA chart); State-by-State Adoption of Selected Ethics 20/20 Commission Policies (ABA chart)</td>
<td>NCBE COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO BAR ADMISSIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As the map on the back of this page shows, six jurisdictions (CO, DC, GA, NY, OR, VA) have rules for all 5 methods; four jurisdictions have rules on 4 methods (IL, NH, PA and TX); and thirteen jurisdictions have rules on 3 methods (AZ, CT, DE, FL, IA, MA, MI, NJ, ND, OH, UT, WA, and WI). [Prior editions of the map erroneously included PA among the “five method” states. This chart covers 50 U.S. states & the District of Columbia.]