

## President

**Jenny C. Barnes**  
Senior Counsel  
American Electric Power  
614.583.6421  
jcbarnes@aep.com

## Vice President

**Christopher Wasson**  
Senior Counsel  
Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company  
614.854.8175  
wassonc@nationwide.com

## Secretary

**Andrea Kirsh**  
Senior Counsel  
American Electric Power  
614.716.1925  
amkirsh@aep.com

## Treasurer

**Robert Gage**  
Corporate Counsel  
BMW Financial Services NA, LLC  
614.789.7380  
robert.gage@bmwfs.com

## Membership and Sponsorship Chair

**Tim Rice**  
Counsel  
Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company  
614.677.7644  
ricet3@nationwide.com

## Program Chair

**Jennifer Spalding**  
Senior Counsel  
Abbott Laboratories  
614.624.7359  
jennifer.spalding@abbott.com

## Immediate Past President

**Brian Mannion**  
Lead Counsel  
Nationwide Financial  
614.677.8655  
manniob@nationwide.com

## Board of Directors

**Paul DePascale**  
**Glori Fitch**  
**Elizabeth Ford**  
**Michael Galeano**  
**Teresa McIntyre**  
**Theresa Schaefer**  
**Laurel Sturm**  
**Nicholas Zuk**

## Chapter Administrator

**Sylvia Cook**  
614.424.7797  
cooks@battelle.org

## Welcome New Members

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

### Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company

*Stephen Ayers*  
*Catherine Geyer*  
*Adam Hall*  
*Steven Herman*  
*Robert Horner*  
*Tara Plett*  
*Gary Sammons*

## Save the Date! Thursday, December 6

### Central Ohio Chapter Annual Meeting—Columbus Museum of Art

Please plan on joining us in the late afternoon of Thursday, December 6 at the Columbus Museum of Art for the Central Ohio Chapter's Annual Meeting sponsored by LexisNexus. Following a brief business meeting, please join the other Chapter members for some year-end socializing over good food and drink and be sure to set aside some time to tour the Museum. More details to follow.

**The next Board Meeting is on Friday, November 9;  
location to be determined.**



1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036-5425



## Jenny C. Barnes President's Message

Dear Central Ohio ACC Members,

Here is a wish for you.

I wish for you to take the time to think—to think about something to do for your professional enrichment. Your enrichment does not need to follow the current big trend, but rather it should reflect a personalized process, purpose, and solution. The value of your enrichment lies in your ability to take the time to think—to shape behavior, inspire, challenge, inform, engage and stimulate.

Whether it's for 10 minutes, a day or a week—just think.

For those of you who respond to visual cues—here it is:



We are all busy professionals, and yet many of us find ways to enrich ourselves. One way I contribute to my professional enrichment is through CO-ACC. It is an effective and efficient organization that allows you to learn, lead, follow, create, and give—whatever you choose.

It's been a busy and productive last few months for CO-ACC. We've had three CLEs, a social event, brown bag lunch with Dick Cheap at Huntington, and numerous board and officer meetings. It is rewarding to work with CO-ACC members who contribute to, and value, their membership in this top professional organization. We welcome your thinking.

Best regards,  
Jenny C. Barnes  
Senior Counsel  
American Electric Power

## Wrap-up of Spring/Summer CO-ACCA Events

### "Pirates of the Scioto": Central Ohio Chapter Hosts Spring Social Event Aboard the Santa Maria

On Friday, May 18, a motley crew of over 45 members and guests of the Central Ohio Chapter of the ACC banded together to discuss the new world of in-house legal practice to socialize, and enjoy drinks, hors d'oeuvres, and music aboard Columbus' own Santa Maria. Anchored along the Scioto River, the Santa Maria is the

world's most authentic and museum-quality replica of Christopher Columbus' flagship. Members and guests had the opportunity to explore the ship while wondering how 15th century sailors could have lived in such rugged conditions. The perfect spring evening was complimented by relaxing music played by a jazz trio stationed on the sterncastle of the ship. Although Johnny Depp could not join us, Dale Heydauff did join the "crew" to give a short presentation about the Scioto

**continued on page 4**

**All in the Corporate Family:  
Privilege and Co-representation  
Issues for In-house Lawyers . . . . .2, 3**

**ACC News Briefs . . . . .5**

**Welcome New Members . . . . .6**

**Save the Date! Thursday, December 6 . .6**

**Board Meeting November 9 . . . . .6**

## 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](http://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](http://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 or 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/parentsbcprprntethics.pdf](http://www.acc.com/public/attyclientpriv/parentsbcprprntethics.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.](http://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,<sup>1</sup> 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-feeding 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](http://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](http://www.acc.com/protected/pubs/docket/nd01/ethics1.php) and [www.acc.com/vl/index.php?action=search&full=yes&anytext=Villa](http://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](mailto:hackett@acc.com). ACC’s advocacy and ethics team is waiting to serve you!

1 See Texas RPC 1.6.

## continued from page 5

Mile Project—a signature riverfront part that is being developed along the Scioto River as it passes through downtown Columbus. The chapter plans on making this an annual event so be sure to keep a weather eye out for next year's announcement. Yo ho, yo ho, a lawyer's life for me!

## Real Estate/Environmental Seminar Held at Wedgewood Country Club

Ulmer & Berne, LLP, sponsored an informative CLE seminar on real estate and environmental issues on May 23. The speakers covered a variety of topics. Ulmer attorney Kristin Walker Boose presented the topic, "Re-forging the Boilerplate: A Case Law Review of Standard Clauses in Real Estate Contracts." Nationwide Insurance attorney Philip W. Lee discussed real estate management, construction contracts, and project management. The new standard for landowner defenses to superfund liability was covered by J. Gregory Smith of Ulmer & Berne. Corporate property owners were brought up to date on the latest Ohio environmental audit laws by Sherry L. Hesselbein, Ulmer & Berne; and Janet J. Henry, American Electric Power. Finally, Robert J. Karl of Ulmer & Berne discussed the topic, "Preparing for and Defending Civil and Criminal Investigations Brought by Environmental Protection Agencies." The seminar was well received by those in attendance. CO-ACC thanks Ulmer & Berne for their excellent program.

## CO-ACC Brown Bag Lunch With a Legal Leader

On May 31, CO-ACC was pleased to provide six of its members with the opportunity to have lunch with one

of the leaders in our profession: Dick Cheap, executive vice president, general counsel, and secretary of The Huntington National Bank. Mr. Cheap graciously hosted a lunch in Huntington's board room. He addressed the legal issues facing Huntington and discussed issues involving effective client relationships and efficient contracting. It was an enjoyable meeting that will certainly help to develop the members' skills, and benefit their employers. Many thanks to Mr. Cheap for his generosity of time and insight.

## Congressman Oxley Shared His Views on the Future of SOX

CO-ACC and Baker Hostetler hosted a CLE program on Commercial Litigation and Sarbanes-Oxley on June 12, at New Albany Country Club. During the Commercial Litigation portion of the program, panelists, including Jessica Mayer, an in-house litigator with Cardinal; Jennifer Spalding, an in-house commercial attorney with Abbott; and Sherri Lazear, a private practice litigator, shared their views on how to identify and limit potential liability. Following the discussion, the day's topics shifted to Sarbanes-Oxley, where attendees heard about the practical effects of the act on public companies, and how far SOX is reaching into the not-for-profit world. This session even featured the timely viewpoints of retiring State Auto general counsel, John Lowther. The final presentation of the day focused on the future of Sarbanes-Oxley and highlighted the perspectives of the act's co-author, former Congressman Michael G. Oxley. In light of the upcoming 5th anniversary of SOX, Mr. Oxley, who now serves as of counsel to Baker Hostetler, spoke about the future application of the law and the impact on companies. The day was capped off by lunch and rousing discussion between attendees and the program presenters. Many thanks to Baker Hostetler for organizing an excellent program!

## ACC News Briefs

### New and Updated InfoPAKs<sup>SM</sup> Add Value to Your Practice

#### Role of the General Counsel

This updated InfoPAK provides some definition of the role, scope, and nature of the duties of a general counsel in a post-enron/Sarbanes-oxley world. By noting some of the issues that arise in the ordinary course of an in-house counsel's practice, this InfoPAK will help general counsel provide high-quality representation for their corporate client. Access it at [www.acc.com/resource/v6685](http://www.acc.com/resource/v6685).

#### Hiring Foreign Nationals in the United States

This updated InfoPAK provides visa specific suggestive strategies for hiring and maintaining uninterrupted employment of foreign nationals. Access it at [www.acc.com/resource/v4704](http://www.acc.com/resource/v4704).

#### Employee Benefits for Domestic Partners and Same Sex Spouses

A company's decision to offer domestic partner or same sex spouse benefits can be fraught with complications. The legal landscape that governs such benefits is constantly changing due to on-going political battles that result in changes to statutes and state constitutions. This new InfoPAK, compiled by Hogan & Hartson, LLP, addresses both the types of benefits that companies may provide to domestic partners and same sex spouses, and the impact of both federal and state laws on those benefits. Access it at [www.acc.com/resource/v8437](http://www.acc.com/resource/v8437).

#### Small Law Department Human Resources Manual—Mexico

The Small law Department Committee, together with its sponsor Meritas, has developed this InfoPAK to help ACC members become more aware of the differences in employment law found in the provinces in Canada ([www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/canadasldmanual.pdf](http://www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/canadasldmanual.pdf)) and in Mexico ([www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/mexicohrmanual.pdf](http://www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/mexicohrmanual.pdf)).

### 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](http://am.acc.com) and register today.

### Advance Your Career; Find Your Next Hire

If you are looking for a new lawyer for your in-house department or looking for your next career move, check out ACC's In-house Jobline<sup>SM</sup>, the premier career website for the in-house community. Here are a few reasons why:

For job seekers:

- Find positions that match your specific criteria, including practice area, geographic location, and job title.
- Browse more than 1,100 current job postings.
- Post your resume for free.
- Explore the online career center, featuring compensation data, and career advancement advice.

For employers:

- Find the right match for your department from the thousands of qualified candidates registered on the website.
- Receive automatic notification when candidates who meet your criteria add their resume to the website.
- Take advantage of a discount on job postings, only for ACC members. Move to the next level with ACC's In-house Jobline: [www.jobline.acc.com](http://www.jobline.acc.com).