

Is this email not displaying correctly? [View In Browser](#)



Issue 126 | September 18

## [ABA Creates Lawyer Well-Being Pledge](#)

### [Several Large Law Firms Sign 7-Point Pledge Toward Lawyer Well-Being](#)

In the aftermath of a landmark study by the ABA Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs and the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, many in the legal profession wondered what could be done to prevent and treat substance-use disorders and mental health problems among lawyers. Now, several large firms have signed a seven-point pledge developed by the ABA Working Group to Advance Well-Being in the Legal Profession. The ABA hopes that by January 1, all legal employers will sign on to the pledge, which asks them to describe the measures they have taken to encourage various aspects of lawyer well-being. [ABA Journal](#) has more details, including what the seven points are, specifically; which firms have signed on; a link to a related toolkit; and what's next for the working group.

### [Georgia Supreme Court Says Board of Bar Examiners Must Explain Why It Declined a Military Spouse Waiver](#)

Last week, the Georgia Supreme Court decided that the state Board of Bar Examiners must give clear reasons why it declined military spouse Harriet O'Neal's application to waive the Georgia bar exam and practice law there. O'Neal, who is a member of the Louisiana bar and married to an U.S. Army infantry captain stationed in Columbus, Ga., has garnered support from the ABA and other national legal groups. Clarity from the Board of Bar Examiners will benefit future military spouses who apply for the waiver, the court's ruling said, and it will also give the court something substantive to review if O'Neal chooses to appeal the board's decision. Learn more at [The Atlanta Journal-Constitution](#).

### [Date Nears for U.S. Supreme Court Conference Involving \*Fleck v. Wetch\*](#)

When U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg asked what implications the *Janus* case could have for unified bars, the plaintiff's lawyer told her that their fees are justified by the state's interest in regulating the practice of law. But *Janus* appears to have opened the door for some bar members to challenge whether mandatory dues are constitutional, or necessary for regulatory purposes. Last week, BLW told you about a federal lawsuit in Oregon; now, the U.S. Supreme Court is nearing its September 24 conference, during which it will consider whether to hear *Fleck v. Wetch*, involving the State Bar Association of North Dakota. [The National Law Journal](#) has more information about both the Oregon and North Dakota cases and what they might mean for other unified bars.

### [Washington State Bar Association, Other States Consider Mandatory Malpractice Insurance](#)

The Washington State Bar Association currently has a task force that is exploring the idea of mandatory malpractice insurance for lawyers. In the bar's [NWL](#) publication, Leslie C. Levin notes that the WSBA is by no means alone in considering whether to require that members maintain lawyer professional liability insurance (LPL). This year, she writes, Idaho became the second state (after Oregon, more than 40 years ago) to institute such a requirement; it's also under consideration in California, New Jersey, and Nevada. Levin

looks at some of the arguments for and against requiring LPL, and at what she thinks can be learned from the states where this requirement is in place or being considered.



---

[Learn more about the ABA Division for Bar Services](#)

[Read the latest issue of Bar Leader Magazine](#)

{{AA\_HTML Manual - Chicago Footer}}