

**PRESENTED AT**

**38<sup>th</sup> Annual Corporate Counsel Institute**

April 7-8, 2016 ▪ Houston, Texas

May 5-6, 2016 ▪ Dallas, Texas

## **Innovative Business Practices and Ethics on the Edge**

**Christopher T. Brown**

## **“Innovative Business Practices and Ethics on the Edge”**

University of Texas School of Law Corporate Counsel Institute

Houston, April 8, 2016

Dallas, May 6, 2016

### **Outline**

Christopher T. Brown

Attorney at Law PLLC

[www.brownlawatx.com](http://www.brownlawatx.com)

### **Background**

Recent headlines are full of stories about innovative companies who collide with government officials when it becomes apparent that their business models are so disruptive they are—at least arguably, or in selected jurisdictions—illegal. Many involve municipal governments applying local ordinances—like livery licensing for rideshare programs in cities like Austin and Houston, or hotel regulation from Berlin to NYC for short-term vacation rentals. At the other extreme are federal criminal prosecutions of cryptocurrency innovators for facilitating money laundering and other illegal activity by failing to follow the federal and state laws governing money services businesses. And consider the entrepreneurs and investors working in the legal marijuana business—where the activity is permitted under state law, but a felony under federal law.

The media coverage often gushes with admiration for entrepreneurial disruptors, especially when they provide services that are wildly popular with middle-class consumers. Sometimes there's a contrarian story, like Ben Wear's March 2015 op-ed in the Austin American-Statesman griping about the hubris of Uber and Lyft's "corporate civil disobedience," but it's hard to complain about hot new tech services that render antiquated and inefficient predecessors obsolete, without coming off like a curmudgeon.

What about the lawyers who advise these companies through their legal challenges? What is their role? Do they have a duty to try to get their clients to abide by the law? Do they have some role as "agent of the state"? Or are they as free as their clients to advocate, and even actively participate in, the violation of laws they think are applicable, and valid, but stupid and in need of change? If they think the law is bad, how do they go about trying to change it?

Most if not all of these companies have lawyers, in many cases experienced in-house lawyers or reputable outside firms. When the client's business model operates at the bleeding edge of law and regulation, lawyers must balance an array of competing ethical duties. And experienced technology practitioners know these sorts of issues have been around for much longer than the smartphone-based sharing economy.

## **Discussion**

What does a lawyer do when her client's business model clearly violates a local transportation ordinance, but management wants to go ahead—arguing that the benefits of grabbing market share and revenue far outweigh the potential costs?

Lawyers have a duty to zealously represent their clients, but they also have a duty not to help their client break the law.

The latter duty is well-established, but ambiguously articulated. Consider Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(d):

A lawyer shall not counsel a client to engage, or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent, but a lawyer may discuss the legal consequences of any proposed course of conduct with a client and may counsel or assist a client to make a good faith effort to determine the validity, scope, meaning or application of the law.

...closely tracked by Texas Rule of Professional Conduct 1.02(c):

A lawyer shall not assist or counsel a client to engage in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent. A lawyer may discuss the legal consequences of any proposed course of conduct with a client and may counsel and represent a client in connection with the making of a good faith effort to determine the validity, scope, meaning or application of the law.

And by California Rule of Professional Conduct 3-210, with some notable variations (emphasis added):

A member shall not advise the violation of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal *unless the member believes in good faith that such law, rule, or ruling is invalid*. A member may take appropriate steps in good faith to test the validity of any law, rule, or ruling of a tribunal.

Prior to the adoption of the Model Rules in 1983, the duty was articulated somewhat differently, in Disciplinary Rule 7-102(A):

“A lawyer shall not...counsel or assist his client in conduct that the lawyer knows to be *illegal* or fraudulent.”

Does that mean it's now entirely permissible to advise a client to proceed with conduct that is illegal, so long as it's not criminal or fraudulent?

One treatise notes that:

“conduct that is ‘illegal’ may not rise to the level of being criminal. Thus, the lawyer will not be disciplined for advising the client in unlawful acts unless those acts are also criminal or fraudulent.”<sup>1</sup>

Does that mean a lawyer can help her client violate the laws of contract, tort, or property? The treatises are short on definitive answers.

When it adopted the Model Rules, the ABA specifically rejected a proposed clause of R. 1.2(d) that would have prevented a lawyer from using prohibited terms or unconscionable provisions in contracts. But the treatises are quick to note that this exclusion doesn’t mean such a practice is permitted.

Can you ethically help management handicap the likelihood that your conduct will be deemed illegal? Analyze the likelihood of enforcement? Help figure out how much upside there is than potential sanction?

If you have concluded the business plan is illegal, but the client has decided to go ahead, can you use your legal skills to help them minimize the likelihood of enforcement and sanction?

How does the analysis work if, as is the case with many regulations administered by executive agencies, the law imposes both civil sanctions and criminal penalties, but civil enforcement is the norm?

How do the provisions of Model Rule 1.16(a)(1) play into the analysis, requiring that:

“...a lawyer shall not represent a client or, where representation has commenced, shall withdraw from the representation of a client if the representation will result in violation of the rules of professional conduct or *other law*.” (emphasis added) (see also Texas Rule of Professional Conduct 1.15(a))

Some specific examples. What, if any, are the ethical limitations on the following?

- Advising a client to breach a contract where the benefits of such breach clearly outweigh the likely costs.
- Advising a client to violate a duty to a third party by explaining the high cost of litigation and small amount of damages will make the consequences of such violation much less than the benefits.
- Advising a client about the potential interpretations of a law that may or may not prohibit a planned business activity.
- Advising a client to proceed with operations in a new market that arguably violate a local

---

<sup>1</sup> Biernat & Mason, *Legal Ethics for Management and Their Counsel* (1995), §4.4(d)

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Innovative Business Practices and Ethics on the Edge

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2016 Corporate Counsel eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
38<sup>th</sup> Annual Corporate Counsel Institute session

"Innovative Business Practices and Ethics on the Edge"