

# Professional Responsibility

BY MARTIN COLE

## Lawyers Dealing With Judges

The judicial election season is now officially upon us. It appears that, despite another two years of concern about the potential for contested judicial elections being heavily funded by out-of-state entities with agendas, the campaign scene will be relatively quiet against incumbents. A few open-seat elections will be interesting, but as best I can judge (pun intended!) at this point, only a very few races appear to include party-political candidates. The potential for such judicial election problems certainly remains an issue, and a realistic issue for the future; but at least for one more election cycle we will again watch other states' nasty campaigns instead of our own ... and that is just fine.

Many lawyers desire to become judges. A judgeship is still a position of public importance, prestige and honor—and financial sacrifice for many private practitioners. Until they become judges, however, lawyers must deal with judges from the perspective of a practicing attorney. In that role, how lawyers are permitted to deal with a judge is governed by several Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct (MRPC).

### Ex Parte Contacts

Perhaps the rule most directly on point is Rule 3.5(g), MRPC, which

states that “[i]n an adversary proceeding a lawyer shall not communicate or cause another to communicate as to the merits of the case with the judge . . . .” This is of course formal codification of the basic tenet that a lawyer may not communicate ex parte with a judge as to the merits of a matter. So does that mean that a lawyer may never communicate

with a judge? Of course not. The rule itself sets out a list of exceptions to the basic premise where a judicial contact is permitted: in the course of official proceedings, in writing if the lawyer promptly delivers a copy of the writing to opposing counsel or to a pro se adverse party, orally upon adequate notice to opposing counsel or to the pro se adverse party, or if otherwise authorized by law. “In the course of official proceedings” obviously allows an attorney to appear and argue the merits to a judge in a proper ex parte hearing, for example.<sup>1</sup>

Issues involved in communicating with a judge pursuant to Rule 3.5(g) usually revolve around the terms “the merits of the case” or “promptly” deliver a copy to opposing counsel. Many lawyers seem to assume the “the merits” and procedural issues are mutually exclusive categories—that is, if an ex parte contact to a judge, or perhaps to the judge’s law clerk or assistant, is about what the lawyer believes to be a procedural matter such as scheduling a motion hearing date, then the prohibition against ex parte contacts does not apply. This is not always true. For example, a request that a judge recuse herself or that opposing counsel be disqualified due to a conflict of interest may not technically be on the merits of a case, but authorities agree that such requests affect the merits of a case or may create an advantage for one party, and thus should be made by motion with proper notice to the other side, and not be allowed ex parte.

As to promptly notifying the other side of a written or oral communication with a judge, generally simultaneous notice has been sufficient, but be careful what that means in today’s instant communication world. Is “cc’ing” opposing counsel via regular mail while faxing or emailing the document to the court adequate?<sup>2</sup> Or, as one lawyer did, is leaving a voice mail message on opposing counsel’s work phone at 11:00 p.m. on a Sunday either prompt

or adequate notice of a hearing set up for Monday at 8:30 a.m.? Such attempts at manipulation are not proper, even though as may be gleaned from the above, it may require an egregious, improper contact to warrant disciplinary involvement. No instances of an attorney being publicly disciplined solely for a violation of Rule 3.5(g) exist.<sup>3</sup>

Of course judges have a correspond-

**“A lawyer who knows that a judge has committed a violation of the applicable Code of Judicial Conduct that raises a substantial question as to the judge’s fitness for office shall inform the appropriate authority.”**

ing duty to not engage in improper ex parte contacts<sup>4</sup> and ought therefore to “cut off” any attempt by a party’s counsel to do so. Rule 8.4(f), MRPC, also prohibits attorneys from assisting or contributing to a judge’s violation of the CJC, which can create a “double whammy” situation for an attorney if the judge were to initiate an ex parte contact.

### Other Rules


There are other rules in the MRPC that impact a lawyer’s dealings with the judiciary. For example, Rule 8.2(a) prohibits an attorney from making “a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge . . . or of a candidate for election” to a judicial position. The standard is an objective one, and a few attorneys have been severely disciplined by the state supreme court for violations of this rule.<sup>5</sup> While the 1st Amendment protects many statements about judges, there are disciplinary limits.

A lawyer’s obligation to report misconduct under Rule 8.3, MRPC, applies to judges as well as to other attorneys: In Minnesota, that will be the Board on Judicial Standards. Here too, note that judges have a corresponding duty to report lawyer misconduct.<sup>6</sup>

One perhaps minor aspect of a lawyer’s dealings with a judge can arise



MARTIN COLE  
is director of the  
Office of Lawyers  
Professional Respon-  
sibility. An alumnus  
of the University of  
Minnesota and of the  
University of Min-  
nesota Law School,  
he has served the  
lawyer disciplinary  
system for 25 years.



## INJURED CLIENT?

Let them know  
*you can help them.*

---

**MICHAEL W. UNGER**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

---

UNGER LAW OFFICE  
4900 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
612.339.3600 • Fax: 612.339.3605  
[mwunger@ungerlegal.com](mailto:mwunger@ungerlegal.com)  
[www.ungerlegal.com](http://www.ungerlegal.com)

When your clients are injured, they don't need to look to TV ads and billboards for help.  
They need to look to you, the attorney they count on to serve them best.

So team up with an experienced injury lawyer who's totally committed  
to supporting and enhancing your trusted client relationships.

For nearly 30 years, I've successfully partnered with referring attorneys to provide them,  
and their injured clients, with expert representation and personal service  
specifically tailored to meet their individual needs.

The results speak for themselves. No catchy slogans required.



Through the generosity of the following 2013 donors,  
LRAP enabled more than 40 legal aid attorneys to serve more than 10,000 low-income clients.

**Leadership Award Sponsors (\$7500 or more)**

Fredrikson & Byron Foundation  
Hamline University School of Law  
Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi, LLP  
University of Minnesota Law School  
University of St. Thomas School of Law  
William Mitchell College of Law

**Platinum (\$5000-\$7499)**  
Briggs and Morgan Foundation  
Lindquist & Vennum, PLLP  
Stinson Leonard Street Foundation

**Silver (\$500-\$2499)**

Arthur, Chapman, Kettering, Smetake & Pikala, PA  
Cooper and Barbara Ashley  
Daniel Brown  
Brian and Elizabeth Dillon  
The Dorsey & Whitney Foundation  
Fifteenth District Bar Association  
Fifth District Bar Association  
First District Bar Association  
Fredrikson & Byron, PA  
Greene Espel, PLLP  
Samuel Hanson  
William Hart  
Henson & Efron, PA  
Valerie and Michael Herring  
Lisa Hollingsworth and Andrew Carlson  
Erin Keyes  
Joani and Joshua Moberg  
Ninth District Bar Association  
Patterson, Thuente, Pederson, PA  
Sixth District Bar Association  
Stoel Rives, LLP  
Twelfth District Bar Association  
Xcel Energy Foundation  
Xcel Energy's Office of General Counsel

**Gold (\$2500-\$4999)**

Gray Plant Mooty Foundation  
Hennepin County Bar Foundation  
Maslon Edelman Borman & Brand, LLP  
Meagher & Geer, PLLP  
Minnesota Chapter Federal Bar Association  
Minnesota Lawyers Mutual Insurance Co.  
Minnesota State Bar Foundation  
Ramsey County Bar Foundation  
Seventh District Bar Association  
Thomson Reuters  
William and Ann Hart Wernz  
*In Memory of Bricker Lavik*

**Bronze (\$250-\$499)**

Anoka County Bar Association  
Arneson & Geffen, PLLC  
J. Richard Bland  
Michael Brandt  
Philip Byrne  
James Dorsey  
Faegre Baker Daniels Foundation  
Nora Fitzpatrick  
Dulce Foster  
Henschel Moberg Goff, PA  
Alexander M. Keith  
Gregory and Karin Roper Kishel  
Mara Koeller  
Craig Komanecki  
Daniel McDonald  
Rosanne Nathanson  
Warren Ortland  
Sixteenth District Bar Association  
Thirteenth District Bar Association  
Michael Vraa  
Terry Wade

**Friends (Up to \$249)**

Lisa Agrimonti  
Joy Anderson  
James Baillie  
Anna Beadle  
Sitso Bediako  
Stephen Befort  
Joan Bibelhausen  
Bolt & Hoffer Law Firm  
John Brian  
Kendra Brodin  
Ann Burkhart  
Karen Burns  
William Burns  
Daniel Cheng  
Mark Christopherson

Mary Cincotta  
Stephanie Cunningham  
Andrew Deutsch  
Joseph Dixon Jr.  
David Dyson  
Stephen Eide  
Larry Espel  
Susan Falch  
James Forman  
Thomas Fraser  
Ann Gemmell  
Timothy and Susanne Goodman  
Mary Grau  
Kent Harbison  
Matthew Hart  
Charles Haynor

William Hefner  
Nancy Kleeman  
Janine Laird  
Carolina Lamas  
Maury Landsman  
Kimberly Larson  
Le Law Firm  
Kathleen Lohmar Exel  
Charles Maier  
Gregory Marita  
Tricia Matzek  
Bridget McCauley Nason  
Meier Schack, LLC  
Timothy Morgan  
Theresa Murray Hughes  
Joshua Ogunleye

Patricia Phill  
Kristy Rodd  
Kent Rossi  
School Law Center, LLC  
Kate Snowdon  
Beth Somerville  
Louis Thayer  
Jon Theobald  
Thomas Tinkham  
Michael Unger  
James Wilkinson III  
Katharine and Nicholas  
Woomer Deters

## Professional Responsibility

in the hiring of a judicial law clerk by a law firm or agency. Rule 1.12, MRPC, provides that a judicial law clerk may negotiate for employment with a party or lawyer who is appearing before the clerk's judge, even if the clerk is personally involved in the matter, as long as the clerk informs her judge of the negotiation. Once hired, the clerk may not, however, represent a party in a matter in which the clerk participated personally and substantially while a clerk; and the entire firm may be disqualified unless the clerk is timely and appropriately screened.

Finally, coming back to judicial elections, Rule 8.2(b) requires that, "A lawyer who is a candidate for judicial office shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Code of Judicial Conduct." Thus, attorneys running for judicial office need to be familiar with those campaign restrictions that remain in force, even after recent federal court decisions have eliminated some such restrictions.<sup>7</sup> So, those wishing to become judges this year should be aware of the current campaign rules; the rest of us must still always follow those rules regulating our dealings with judges. ▲

### **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> See also, Rule 3.3(d), MRPC, which requires a lawyer in an ex parte proceeding to inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer, whether or not those facts are adverse. Also note that a properly noticed motion or other proceeding to which the adverse party fails to show is not considered ex parte a lawyer certainly may argue the merits to the judge in such a situation.

<sup>2</sup> Electronic filing, as is required in federal district court in Minnesota, helps eliminate this scenario.

<sup>3</sup> In combination with other violations, however, attorneys have been publicly disciplined. See, e.g., *In re Jensen*, 468 N.W.2d 541 (Minn. 1999).

<sup>4</sup> Rule 2.9, Minnesota Code of Judicial Conduct (MCJC).

<sup>5</sup> *In re Graham*, 453 N.W.2d 313 (Minn. 1990); *In re Nathan*, 671 N.W.2d 578 (Minn. 2003); *In re Nett*, 839 N.W.2d 716 (Minn. 2013).

<sup>6</sup> Rule 2.15(B), MCJC.

<sup>7</sup> See, *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*, 536 U.S. 765 (2002); *Wersal v. Sexton*, 674 F.3d 1010 (8th Cir. 2012), cert. denied 133 S.Ct. 209 (2012).



### Professional Paralegal & Research Services

- Legal/Factual Research and Analysis
- Contract/Document Review/Drafting
- Investigations and Witnesses interviewing
- Public Records Searches and Filings
- Legal Fee Auditing and Petitions
- Site Photography
- Trial Prep and Assistance

**Pay only for the services you need when you need them.**



**Visit Our New Website**  
**[www.millmanparalegal.com](http://www.millmanparalegal.com)**

**952-894-3822**

D. Kevin Briggs, CSOP  
Senior Vice President  
Trust Manager  
kbriggs@ubtmn.com  
612-436-1440

## LOOKING FOR A CORPORATE TRUSTEE THAT'S ADVISOR FRIENDLY?

Contact Kevin for more information!



**UNION BANK  
& TRUST**

312 Central Avenue SE • Minneapolis • 612-436-1424  
[www.ubtmn.com/trust-services](http://www.ubtmn.com/trust-services)





By AMY LINDGREN

*Photos by Stan Waldhauser*