

**STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF ABA MODEL RULE 5.5\***  
**(MULTIJURISDICTIONAL PRACTICE OF LAW)**

**\*MODEL RULE 5.5 PRIOR TO THE AUGUST 2012 AND FEBRUARY 2013 COMMISSION ON ETHICS 20/20 REVISIONS AND THE  
 FEBRUARY 16, 2016 REVISIONS**

|    | Highest Court has adopted a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(13) | Highest Court has adopted a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(34) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(1 - MS) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States that are not considering adopting a MJP Rule<br><br>(3- HI, MT, and TX) |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| AL |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| AK | X  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| AZ |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| AR | X  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| CA |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| CO |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| CT |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| DE |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |
| DC |  | X<br>(Rule 49, D.C.<br>Ct. of Apps.)                                       |  |   |  |  |  |
| FL |  | X  |  |   |  |  |  |

|    | Highest Court has adopted a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(13) | Highest Court has adopted a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(34) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(1 - MS) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States that are not considering adopting aMJP Rule<br><br>(3- HI, MT, and TX) |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| GA |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| HI |  |  |  |   |  |  | X   |
| ID |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| IL | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| IN | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| IA | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| KS |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| KY |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| LA |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| ME |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| MD | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| MA | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| MI |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| MN |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| MS |  |  |  | X   |  |  |   |
| MO |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |

|    | Highest Court has adopted a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(13) | Highest Court has adopted a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(34) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(1 - MS) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States that are not considering adopting aMJP Rule<br><br>(3- HI, MT, and TX) |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| MT |  |  |  |   |  |  | X   |
| NE | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NV |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NH | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NJ |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NM |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NY |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| NC |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| ND |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| OH |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| OK |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| OR |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| PA |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| RI | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |

|    | Highest Court has adopted a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(13) | Highest Court has adopted a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(34) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | Recommendation pending in highest Court to adopt a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(1 - MS) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule identical to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States whose MJP study committees have recommended adoption of a rule similar to ABA Model Rule 5.5<br><br>(0) | States that are not considering adopting aMJP Rule<br><br>(3- HI, MT, and TX) |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| SC |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| SD |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| TN |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| TX |  |  |  |   |  |  | X   |
| UT |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| VT | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| VA |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| WA | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| WV | X  |  |  |   |  |  |   |
| WI |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |
| WY |  | X  |  |   |  |  |   |

**Copyright © 2016 American Bar Association. All rights reserved. Nothing contained in this chart is to be considered the rendering of legal advice. The chart is intended for educational and informational purposes only. We make every attempt to keep the chart as accurate as possible. If you are aware of any inaccuracies in the chart, please send your corrections or additions and the source of that information to John Holtaway, (312) 988-5298, [john.holtaway@americanbar.org](mailto:john.holtaway@americanbar.org)**