



Richard A. Ransom President's Message

While relaxing on a wonderful vacation in North Carolina, I have been reflecting on some of the past accomplishments and future plans of the Baltimore Chapter.

We are planning a wonderful celebration of the chapter's 10th Anniversary. Many of the folks who played key roles in getting the chapter off to a strong start will be invited to join the celebration. See Lynne Durbin's note below for more details.

Andy Lapayowker, our innovative webmistress (hey, that just happens to be the official name for this position), has done an excellent job all year long upgrading our chapter website. His latest brainstorm involves a series of links

to websites of great interest to in-house lawyers practicing in Maryland. Everyone should add the links page to their favorites list. Andy has more on these links in his message below.

Maureen Dry has done a terrific job making the golf/spa event one of the highlights of our annual schedule during the past six years, and this year's golf/spa may have been the best ever. Nevertheless, the board is considering switching to a sponsor/member social event that will appeal to a broader cross section of our members. If you have any ideas in this regard, please share them with me or another member of our board.

See you at the 10th Anniversary celebration!

Dick Ransom
richard.ransom@constellation.com

Welcome New Members

We wish to welcome the following new members who have joined our chapter recently:

- John E. Burke,**
Bally Total Fitness Corporation
- David N. Copas,**
Fieldstone Investment Corporation
- Robert H. Ingle,**
Northrop Grumman Corp
- Stacey Y. Jackson,**
DavCo Restaurants, Inc.
- Denise McNairn,**
Response Genetics, Inc.
- William L. Olsen,**
Bechtel Corporation
- Edward T. Paulis,**
Zurich North America
- Jennifer A. Smith,**
Columbia Association

Upcoming Events

- September 19** When There's an "I" and a "P" in "M&A": What Buyers and Sellers of Companies with IP Need to Know
- September 27** ACC Baltimore Chapter 10th Anniversary Social
- October 9** What's Keeping the GC Awake at Night?
- November 15** Best Practices in Protecting Your Online Brand
- December 5** General Membership Lunch on Labor and Employment

For more information on upcoming chapter events, go to www.accbaltimore.com.

- All in the Corporate Family: Privilege and Co-representation Issues for In-house Lawyers2**
- Get A Year's Worth Of CLE at ACC's 2007 Annual Meeting4**
- Learn the Basics to a Successful In-house Career at Canadian CCU4**
- Webmistress Update4**
- Counting Down to 10 Years Old: Save the Date of September 275**

All in the Corporate Family: Privilege and Co-representation Issues for In-house Lawyers

By Susan Hackett
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Association of Corporate Counsel (ACC)

Martine Turcotte is a very happy lady—at least for a while. She recently won a decision for her client, BCE—the Canadian telecommunications giant—in a US federal court in a case that raised questions (and the specter of unpleasant results) about what many of us do on a daily basis without a lot of thought. Martine's experience provides a caution to us all—don't provide legal advice to subsidiaries without safeguards in place.

Many ACC members work in companies that have partially or wholly-owned parents, subsidiaries or affiliates—call them corporate family members. Many times, and certainly when the entities fully share the same ultimate ownership, in-house counsel provide advice for entities across the family (and their employer client's "borders"), in order to ensure that appropriate policies and practices are adopted and followed by each of the entities. It's in each of the entire family's interests for other members of the family to stay out of trouble (avoiding reputational run-off) at least, and at best to be properly coordinated when they share a variety of common interests: the same regulators, suppliers, customers, industry partners, investors, and so on. And for the most part, this approach works very well. Indeed, we all know the repercussions that would follow a failure in a related entity that the parent or other corporate family members knew about but "ignored": the entire family of brands would be tarnished and the entire entity group pilloried.

But even cross-counseling that works well "for the most part" still has room for the exceptions. Martine's company, BCE, has been engaged in a grueling battle before the Delaware courts for more than five years litigating with former US subsidiaries and their creditors regarding BCE's decision to stop financing the operations of one of its struggling former subs, Teleglobe. The two sides haven't gotten to the meat of the underlying matter yet. They're still arguing over privilege claims stemming from whether client services provided by BCE in-house lawyers to Teleglobe (when it was a sub) entitle Teleglobe to see BCE privileged communications and work product that would otherwise be protected from a hostile party's discovery demands.

The disputed material pertains to BCE's inside and outside legal advice to the client regarding its decision to pull their financing, including presentations by BCE's chief legal officer—Martine Turcotte—to the board and opinions from outside law firms, all discussing ramifications of the company's decisions on the defensibility of the kind of litigation it now faces. BCE claims that these events occurred after they severed joint representation of the sub; Teleglobe claims otherwise, arguing it has the right to see everything that passed through BCE's in-house law department because in-house lawyers, at one time, had provided Teleglobe with legal advice on the financial commitments, meaning the subsidiaries share the legal privilege.

When Martine approached ACC and asked for our opinion and support, we thought the issue was one that deserved attention; after reviewing the facts and the rules, we decided to file amicus rather than risk allowing the lower court's decisions in favor of Teleglobe's discovery demands to become precedent. Our brief is online at www.acc.com/public/amicus/teleglobe.pdf.

The Court of Appeals agreed with BCE's and ACC's arguments, citing our amicus in a 93-page decision written by Judge Ambrose and handed down July 17, 2007 (www.acc.com/public/amicus/teleglobeopinion.pdf). The court vacated an order from the US District Court in Delaware that would have forced BCE to produce 900 privileged documents, remanding it back for further examination. But they didn't stop there. They all but wrote a handbook on how parents and subsidiaries can steer through the tricky shoals of shared legal advice and keep the parent's privilege intact. Along the way, the court discusses a number of major issues and doctrines, including (1) the attorney-client privilege, (2) the disclosure rule and the requirement that communications be in confidence, (3) privileged information sharing under (a) the co-client or joint-client privilege and (b) the community-of interest common-interest privilege, (4) the exception for adverse litigation, and (5) the problems that arise when the interests of the clients in the joint representation begin to diverge.

What I'll discuss further below and what the court held is this: There's nothing wrong and a lot right with the concept of in-house counsel providing legal services across corporate family lines. But there are risks and they can be addressed with forethought. Indeed, it is advisable for in-house counsel to have paperwork in place so that the moment parent and subsidiary realize their interests might diverge through spin-off, insolvency or sale, the parent can sever its legal ties and counsel arrangement, and get the subsidiary separate legal counsel. But, as these deals can take months to play out, there's no reason the parent can't then continue to provide the subsidiary with legal advice on other non-related matters without putting its privilege at risk.

Good advice, but of course, when is "the moment" of realization, how can the shared legal services relationship be effectively severed, and what is now to be avoided as conflicted representation, and more?

ACC has created an important article (www.acc.com/public/attyclientpriv/parentsbcprsnattethics.pdf) that reviews the following issues for your consideration to avoid learning BCE's lesson the hard way:

- When, and to what extent, the representation of wholly or less than wholly-owned entities by a single in-house legal department raises conflicts issues for in-house counsel.
- An overview of attorney-client and work product privilege in the context of multi-entity enterprises.
- Conflicts and privilege issues that can arise once the decision has been made to sell an entity or its assets, or once the sale has been completed.

* Please note that this article was written before the BCE case was decided, and while we're amending it to reflect the impact of this recent decision, it may not be finished with those revisions by the time you read it!

Further, we suggest that you may wish to consider executing a form of a joint defense agreement if you/your legal team provides services to multiple entities in the corporate family. A joint defense agreement allows a counsel for one client to work with another client on matters in which they share common interests, and which they agree do not present conflicts. A joint defense agreement asks the parties to recognize that the lawyer represents one of the clients and the lawyer's loyalties will remain with that

client should common interests at some point diverge. Thus, if a conflict arises in the future, the joint defense relationship is automatically severed. It's a neat little tool that's simple to execute and helps protect both you (professionally), and your client (in case business interests diverge in the future) resulting from your services provided across the corporate family. (www.acc.com/vl/index.php?action=search&full=yes&anytext=Joint+Defens.)

I've borrowed and consolidated some of the themes from our overview of joint representation in a multi-entity environment for your consideration below. Thanks and cudos go to Peter Jarvis of Hinshaw & Culbertson, one of ACC's ethics specialists.

Current-Client Conflicts of Interest in a Multi-Entity Setting

There is no general black letter rule of professional conduct that defines the term "client," and a favorite on the in-house counsel ethics hit parade is always the topic of identifying the client in thorny situations. On the other hand, ABA Model Rule 1.13, Organization as Client, provides a starting point: I've included some of the pertinent sections below:

- (a) A lawyer employed or retained by an organization represents the organization acting through its duly authorized constituents.
- (f) In dealing with an organization's directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders or other constituents, a lawyer shall explain the identity of the client when the lawyer knows, or reasonably should know, that the organization's interests are adverse to those of the constituents with whom the lawyer is dealing.
- (g) A lawyer representing an organization may also represent any of its directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders or other constituents, subject to the provisions of Rule 1.7 [regarding certain conflicts of interest]. If the organization's consent to the dual representation is required by Rule 1.7, the consent shall be given by an appropriate official of the organization other than the individual who is to be represented, or by the shareholders.

According to Comment [1] to this rule, the words "Other constituents" refers to "the positions equivalent to officers, directors, employees and shareholders held by persons acting for organizational clients that are not corporations." Thus, it does not expressly include all ostensibly related entities. On the other hand, "constituents" can certainly include entities that are stockholders in other entities, and the rule more broadly acknowledges that representations may cross single organizational lines.

If, in fact, any non-clients appear to be in doubt about whether the lawyer represents them, the lawyer must explain that she does not. See *id.*; ABA Model Rule 4.3. Whether in a context of entity or individual clients, the test developed in caselaw and in ethics opinions to determine who is and is not a client, depends upon the subjective belief of the putative client and secondarily on proof of facts that it was, at least to some degree, reasonable for the client to hold such a belief.

Stated another way, in-house counsel who actually provides legal advice to multiple entities, or who allows those entities to form the reasonable belief that they are clients, will be held to have multiple clients. Once this conclusion is reached, the attendant duties of loyalty and confiden-

tiality that are part of the representation of any client apply to these intended or unintended entity clients. As a practical matter, the only way for counsel to seek to limit these duties once they attach is first expressly to disclaim them (in writing, if at all possible) and then to make sure that her conduct is consistent with any disclaimers. And the only way to be certain that an attorney-client relationship is at an end is to end it clearly and unambiguously. When a client has reasonable, ongoing expectations of a relationship based on a history of past work, a court may view the relationship as a current-client relationship even though, as of a particular date, the lawyer is not actually doing work for that client.

The Current-Client Conflicts Rule

ABA Model Rule 1.7 is typical of current-client conflicts rules throughout the US and, in fact, has directly been adopted in some form by most United States jurisdictions. It provides in pertinent part that:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest. A concurrent conflict of interest exists if:

- (1) The representation of one client will be directly adverse to another client; or
- (2) There is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person, or by a personal interest of the lawyer.

(b) Notwithstanding the existence of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:

- (1) The lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
- (2) The representation is not prohibited by law;
- (3) The representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal; and
- (4) Each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing.

The current-client conflicts rules can briefly be summarized in terms of veto power. Although Texas takes a different approach as a matter of state law,¹ the current client always has veto power to prevent the lawyer from acting adversely to that client in all other United States jurisdictions. Indeed, in some situations (which vary from state to state) a lawyer cannot proceed adversely to a current client even with consent. See, e.g., *In re Johnson*, 300 Or. 52, 707 P.2d 573 (1985); Restatement (Third) of the Law: Law Governing Lawyers §128, reporters' note cmt. c (2000) ("Restatement").

It also bears mention that over time, a situation that did not initially present a conflict or require a waiver can develop into one that does. Similarly, a previously valid waiver may have to be repeated if the facts change in material and unanticipated manners. In fact, it is also possible that a situation that began as one in which no conflict existed, or in which only a waiveable conflict existed, can turn into one in which (depending upon the rules of the jurisdiction) continuing representation, even with a waiver, is not permissible. See, e.g., *In re Stauffer*, 327 Or. 44, 956 P.2d 967 (1998); Oregon Formal Op. Nos. 2005-122, 2005-40.

One final point. Legal departments are "firms" within the meaning of the conflicts rules. See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 1.0(c). Unless the situation is one in which screening to

avoid conflicts is permitted by applicable law, a current-client conflict that is attributable to one in-house lawyer will be attributed to all members of the legal department—the same rule that applies to outside firms. See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 1.10; Restatement §123, cmt. d(i) (2000).

As a general proposition, all representations of multiple "current" clients create at least a theoretical potential for conflicts, but again generally, simultaneous presentation of wholly commonly owned and solvent entities will not usually lead to conflicts problems. When common ownership is less than complete, the potential for current-client conflicts becomes greater—even if one of the entities has a sufficient ownership interest in the other to exercise effective control. When the interests of multiple but related clients are in conflict, conflict waivers must be obtained from disinterested parties in order for the joint legal representation to continue since the in-house lawyer is professionally obligated to its employer-client under the rules previously discussed.

In the situation of an insolvent related entity, it is a matter of black letter law that management and the board of the entity owe their duties to continue to run the entity for the benefit of its creditors, and not for the benefit of its equity owners (as would be the case if the business were solvent). In what are called "deepening insolvency" situations, lawyers and other advisers whose actions increase the degree of insolvency (and therefore of creditor debt) in an attempt to assist the equity owners are at risk of being sued. While there are many unknowns in these situations, it seems relatively clear that in-house counsel of a multi-entity enterprise who wish to act for the benefit of a solvent entity and to the detriment of an insolvent entity, and who appreciate that's what they are doing, act at their potential peril.

So what about the attorney-client privilege—how is it applied in a multi-entity joint relationship? In general, if there is co-representation on an issue, then there is co-attorney-client privilege, which can be enforced against third parties, as well as now-feuding entity family members. (There can be privilege between co-entities sharing a lawyer, as well as separate privilege that is not shared if the entities have their own counsel on non-shared matters, too. They are not mutually exclusive.)

Thus, in Martine's case, the court held that documents created by the in-house lawyers during the joint representation were discoverable to both parties. The dispute arose over documents and communications that took place after BCE claimed it had severed its joint legal relationship on all relevant counseling to its sub. And the court agreed that it is possible to not only sever the joint defense relationship in its entirety on a going-forward basis, but also possible to continue representation on non-disputed matters (say, IP management or environmental compliance) and sever it on disputed matters (relating to financial business decisions, for instance).

Of course, all of the rules pertaining to privilege still apply: it can be waived if confidentiality is broken by any party to the privilege (include the related entity which has received legal services from another family members' lawyer and then divulges the confidential information to a third party), it does not survive the crime fraud rule exceptions, and it does not prevent anyone from investigating facts (since privilege doesn't cover facts, it covers communications and related work product of lawyers). See ACC's resources defining in-house privilege application, waiver, and best practices to ensure that privilege is properly protected: www.acc.com/php/cms/index.php?id=84.

The trickiest part of the equation is figuring out at what point the relationship must be severed in order to be able to claim privilege with lawyers who formerly advised from now-hostile subs: Is the point prior to any "negative" assessments or actions, or upon some form of notice? Or is there some kind of material conflict standard? The answer is not clear, and thus, ACC recommends considering adoption of joint defense agreements between entities sharing legal counsel. This enables the company to notice the affiliates, with whom it's sharing counsel, of what the terms of the sharing are, and also to sever the relationship formally when there is concern that a notice that can be pointed to must be given.

Other Practical Considerations:

- Consider non-representation of some entities: just because you can, doesn't mean you should. Some entities may not be well suited to share your services because of the potential for conflicts or waivers or other issues. It's okay to just say "no" and encourage them to get their own counsel.
- Clearly limit the scope of representation (and do it in writing): don't try to be everybody's lawyer for everything, or you may end up being barred from being anybody's lawyer for anything. If their needs are many, then other family members may need to hire their own in-house counsel or the family may wish to pay for outside representation where it's needed. This is especially important if the affiliate might at some time be sold: where documents are requested by the buyer, it will be easier to limit them to those covered in the scope of representation.
- If you do need to sever the relationship, ABA Model Rules 1.9 and 1.10 allow you to do so, only if you end it prior to any material legal work impacting the severed party's representation has begun. So don't wait to sever a relationship until the matter raising a conflict is too ripe.
- Confirm in writing what will or will not be shared before the representation begins to help ensure that if and when it ends, the files that may be open to both parties are limited to those agreed upon in advance.
- Beware the "sale" of privilege before the sale of assets is considered in a related entity that has shared legal services and is now to be sold. See John Villa's excellent article on this subject at www.acc.com/protected/pubs/docket/nd01/ethics1.php and www.acc.com/vl/index.php?action=search&full=yes&anytext=Villa.
- Watch what goes out the door and act promptly if a mistake is made and something is inadvertently disclosed. Generally, if inadvertently disclosed and quickly remedied, the rules and courts will allow you to put something that shouldn't have been shared back into the privileged "box."

The only thing that's clear is that there is still much that is unclear for the counsel who navigates this twisting path. But the need for, and practicality of co-counseling related entities is so apparent, and the risks attendant to ignoring ill-advised behaviors in related entities is so high, that today's in-house lawyer (and her client) has little choice but to venture forth and provide co-counsel. But, forewarned is forearmed: Exercise caution!

If you have questions or if I can be of service, please feel free to call me at 202.293.4103, x318, or email me at hackett@acc.com. ACC's advocacy and ethics team is waiting to serve you!

1 See Texas RPC 1.6.

Webmistress Update

By Andy Lapayowker, Board of Directors,
ACC Baltimore Chapter

Want to find out if your CFO has been convicted of fraud or pedophilia in Maryland? Can't quite remember that Maryland Code section that allows you to practice as an in-house counsel without being admitted in the state? Wish you could quickly locate the Circuit Court courthouse in Wicomico County? The members of the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee?

Absolutely everything you need to know as a complete Maryland in-house counsel has been collected and assembled on one convenient page at www.accbaltimore.com. Just click on the tab called Maryland Legal Links for one-stop access to the Maryland Code, COMAR, county and municipal codes, federal and state court opinions, Wikipedia's entry for the state, census data, and much, much more.

While commercial services offer many of these databases with easier search capabilities, the sites listed on our page are all available at no charge. However, in some cases you may have to do a free registration or accept terms of service to access materials.

On the off-chance that we have not already assembled everything you need to know, please let us know of additional sites that you find useful. All sites suitable for posting on www.accbaltimore.com should offer substantial content at no cost, and should be useful to a substantial number of Maryland in-house counsel. We will also consider sites that offer to increase the general knowledge or hilarity of members of this elite slice of the Maryland bar.

Please email all proposed sites, comments, suggestions, and insults to alapayowker@crowncentral.com.

We continue to update the Program Materials section of the site with handouts and other materials from our lunch meetings. The latest additions include the Best Practices program by Tom O'Neil from DLA Piper and the presentation on severance agreements by Harriet Cooperman of Saul Ewing. Tom's materials include the DOJ's "McNulty memo" on federal prosecution of business entities, as well as the testimony of ACC's Chair on the impact of that memo. Harriet has included form language for possible use in your company's severance agreements.

Get A Year's Worth Of CLE at ACC's 2007 Annual Meeting

ACC offers the best continuing legal education for in-house counsel. Our 2007 Annual Meeting (October 29-31 in Chicago, IL) provides corporate practitioners with over 100 CLE-approved sessions from which to choose. Various tracks of programming developed by in-house counsel for in-house counsel cover a wide range of legal and management topics including intellectual property, litigation, labor & employment, corporate & securities, international, and financial services. Plus, you'll get a year's worth of CLE in one shot. Don't miss out! Go to am.acc.com and register today.

Learn the Basics to a Successful In-house Career at Canadian CCU

Whether you practice in Canada, the United States or are involved in work that crosses the border, in-house counsel face a number of similar challenges. Open only to in-house counsel, Canadian CCU (November 18-20, The Metropolitan Hotel, Toronto, ON) teaches attendees how to excel in their new role with a focus on the basics you need to succeed. Registrants will learn first-hand from in-house colleagues the tools and best practices necessary to foster a successful in-house career. Network with the best and brightest in the in-house legal profession! Register for only \$575 US at ccucanada.acc.com.

Counting Down to 10 Years Old: Save the Date of September 27

President

Richard Ransom

CounselConstellation Energy
410.783.3667
Richard.Ransom@constellation.com

President Elect

H. Ward Classen

Associate Deputy General Counsel
Computer Sciences Corporation
410.691.6586
hclassen@csc.com

Secretary

Lynne Kane

Attorney
410.269.1441
lkane3@comcast.net

Treasurer

Christopher Rahl

Senior Vice President and Senior Counsel
Provident Bank of Maryland
410.277.2849
crahl@provbank.com

Immediate Past President

Frank Aquino

Vice President & General Counsel
EA Engineering, Science, & Technology, Inc.
410.527.2446
faquino@eaest.com

Board of Directors

Maureen Dry
Lynne Durbin
Raissa Kirk
AndrewLapayowker
William Maseth
Fiona Mensah
Kevin O'Neill
Gunther Oakey
Michael Sawicki

Chapter Administrator

Stacey Stepek

410.691.6541
sstepek@csc.com

By Lynne Durbin, Board of Directors, ACC Baltimore Chapter

Well, it is almost here! Our chapter's 10th Anniversary is officially on October 22 (when the national ACC board voted to allow our nascent group to become a full-fledged chapter), but we are jumping the gun by a month. Mark your calendars now for a wonderful cocktail party at the Rusty Scupper in the Inner Harbor on September 27. We will have a beautiful deck overlooking the harbor, as well as inside space in case the weather Gods do not cooperate. A copy of the Official Invitation and a link to RSVP can be found on the 10th Anniversary Celebration page of www.accbaltimore.com.

Throughout the evening we will be remembering significant events and people related to our chapter. There will be trivia quizzes and prizes. We are also working on a slide show of pictures from Golf and Spa and other events over the years. We will even be giving out some special awards.

Please make plans to attend; spouses are also invited. Make an evening of it with a stroll around the harbor and dinner! This unique event has been made possible in part by our special 10th Anniversary Event Sponsors—Saul Ewing, DLA Piper, CSC, and Whiteford Taylor & Preston. Many thanks to the sponsors.

To get you in the mood, we will start our trivia contest now. The first person to answer the following three questions correctly and email the answer to ldurbin@arglobal.com will win a \$25 iTunes gift card!

Here we go:

1. Who is the only person to have served as president of the chapter for 2 years?
2. Who was the representative of a legal research company who helped get the chapter started?
3. Who is the current chapter secretary? (okay, this is a give-away!)

I look forward to hearing from you and to seeing you on the 27th!