

**Case Delays and
Insufficient Client Communications**

Submitted by Prof. Sara Anne Hook

IV. Case Delays and Insufficient Client Communications

Written by Sara Anne Hook, M.B.A., J.D. and Cori Faklaris, M.S. Student, Indiana University
School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI*

A. Legal Ethics of Email

As provided in Rule 1.4 of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct:

Indiana Rules of Court
Rules of Professional Conduct
Including Amendments made through April 30, 2015,
http://www.in.gov/judiciary/rules/prof_conduct/prof_conduct.pdf, accessed 10/28/15.

Rule 1.4. Communication

- (a) A lawyer shall:
 - (1) promptly inform the client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(e), is required by these Rules;
 - (2) reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished;
 - (3) keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter;
 - (4) promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; and
 - (5) consult with the client about any relevant limitation on the lawyer's conduct when the lawyer knows that the client expects assistance not permitted by the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law or assistance limited under Rule 1.2(c).
- (b) A lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.

The comment to this Rule goes on to note that “Reasonable communication between the lawyer and the client is necessary for the client effectively to participate in the representation.” Such communications today as a matter of course will include those via electronic means. The foremost of these means remains email.

Clients expect their attorneys and their offices to be regularly reachable via email. Make sure you or a staff member monitors your email inboxes on a regular basis to ensure that you do not miss any client communications. Set a policy of responding (as an office) to emails within a set period of time during a weekday, even if only with a reply that postpones a full response:

“That’s an interesting question. Let me do some research and get back to you.” Alternately, you could set up an automatic reply to incoming client email that thanks them for the message and includes the office’s main telephone number for those who require an immediate response. If you know that you will be unreachable at certain times or during periods such as an out-of-town vacation, make this clear to clients in advance and set an “Out of Office” message on your email that includes the name, email and phone number of an attorney or staff member to contact in your absence.

Ask clients upfront about their communication preferences and make a note of them with their case files. Some clients might want all communications to be made via telephone and/or U.S. mail, while others will prefer email or text messaging. It is important to provide an overview of the risks of waiving attorney-client privilege if communication methods are not secure or if confidential information is revealed or provided to third parties. For communications with the latter groups about serious or substantial matters regarding a case, you may choose to enclose a written statement within an email or text message as an attachment.

Your email communications should strike a professional tone and be easy to read. Proper grammar and spelling should be used throughout. If you struggle in these areas, ask a staff member with these skills to review your emails before they are sent. Similarly, if you are questioning the appropriateness of a turn of phrase or overly technical legal language, get a second pair of eyes on your email draft before hitting Send. Some attorneys may find it prudent to set up a system of review in which they save emails in Draft or otherwise put them on a delay to be reviewed by a staff member or themselves prior to being sent out, to guard against badly worded or erroneous messages.

As you might have guessed, you should also avoid sharing via email any overly personal information, partisan language or otherwise potentially offensive content, such as off-color jokes. Never start drafting a message in your email program while angry, either. If you are feeling strong emotions and have an urge to fire off a sharply worded email, open up an offline word-processing program such as Microsoft Word and start writing in that program instead. Then put the document away for an hour or two. You may find that the act of writing it was sufficient to cool your head and thus easily send that document to the Recycle Bin instead of the intended recipient.

It is important to implement a method for preserving emails and other electronic client communications so that they are easily accessed when needed. Many case-management systems will offer email archiving along with other features such as calendar and billing management. Alternately, Microsoft offers an email plugin called Credenza that will add this functionality to Outlook. The American Bar Association offers a comparison chart of different software options on its website at <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/tech/ltrc/charts/pmtbchart.authcheckdam.pdf> (accessed 10/29/15).

When answering client emails, avoid the use of the Reply All button. It is far too easy to accidentally include parties who are not part of your direct attorney-client relationship, especially if clients have cc'd friends, family or coworkers on their original emails to you or your office. Similarly, avoid using Forward to share client emails with staff members or other parties, which could expose confidential information in the email chain that was never intended for their eyes. Instead, copy the relevant section (e.g. a request to schedule a meeting) into a new email

message. You may want to disable the Reply All and Forward actions in your email software to head off any problems before they occur.

If you do hit Send on an email that you belatedly realize was sent in error or included information or an attachment that violates confidentiality, immediately attempt to cancel it using Recall this Message (Microsoft Outlook) or similar commands. Many times, however erroneous emails cannot be recalled. In these cases, be sure to apologize promptly to both your client and the erroneous recipient(s) and ask the recipient(s) to delete the message. One feature of email that was intended to be helpful can in fact result in ethical breaches, which is the ability of the email system to fill in the rest of an email address after you have typed only a few characters. Thus, a quick glance to be sure of the recipient's identity is worth the bit of extra time you might take to do this.

Clients also should be cautioned to exercise care themselves in handling emails and other electronic communications in order to preserve their confidentiality. For instance, a client should be advised never to use an employer-provided computer, mobile phone or email address to send, read or download substantive emails about legal matters. The risk is high that employers or other third parties will access them. (Note that this may also result in a waiver of the attorney-client privilege, as illuminated by a number of recent cases as well as ABA Formal Opinion 11-459, Duty to Protect the Confidentiality of E-mail Communications with One's Client, August 4, 2011, http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/YourABA/11_459.authcheckdam.pdf, accessed 10/29/15.) Similarly, in a divorce or custody action, the client may not realize the need to change passwords or reinstall their mobile phone software to prevent the estranged spouse or

partner from accessing their emails. You may need to walk the client through the process of setting up a new, private email address with a provider such as Google.

The advent of push notifications of emails (as well as text messages, social media posts and other online content) to mobile phone screens also adds a new concern for how client communications are handled. Attorneys are strongly cautioned to avoid enabling such notifications to their mobile phones' lock screens because of the volume of confidential messages they receive. With particularly sensitive matters, clients also may need to be cautioned to disable such notifications to avoid the chance of tipping off anyone in the vicinity of their mobile phones as to the legal issues in play. Some attorneys may also want to avoid the use of specific details or keywords in subject lines and in the first few lines of the email body, to avoid the disclosure of confidential or sensitive material in an email app's preview pane on clients' mobile screens.

The above information does not mean that you should avoid using a disclaimer notice at the bottom of your email template. Many attorneys include such notices to warn against unauthorized use, alert recipients to attorney-client confidentiality and possible legal privilege for contents, disclaim loss or damages from any viruses, and caution about tax advice per IRS Circular 230. However, these stock disclaimers are no "substitute for discipline and good judgment," as John Hutchins wrote in his Feb. 12, 2013 article "Do Email Disclaimers Really Work?" for the American Bar Association website (*see* <http://apps.americanbar.org/litigation/committees/technology/articles/winter2013-0213-do-email-disclaimers-really-work.html>, accessed 10/29/15). "Training, communication, and reinforcement offer your best hope of ensuring that your emails—and those of others in your organization—end up only where you intend to send them."

B. Texting, Online Chat, “Friending” Clients on Facebook

Increasing numbers of people now prefer text messages and mobile messaging apps to phone and email for their communications. The Pew Research Center report “Mobile Messaging and Social Media 2015” (available at <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/19/mobile-messaging-and-social-media-2015/>, accessed 10/29/15) found that 67 percent of adults now are smartphone owners, and 37 percent of smartphone owners are using messaging apps such as WhatsApp or iMessage. Your clients may well be among them.

Moreover, clients who are employed often can’t talk with an attorney via phone or email during working hours. Unfortunately, these are likely to be the times when you most need to reach them. Texting may be the only way to communicate quickly in these situations.

Not every type of client communication is suitable for text messaging. The best uses are for reminding clients of upcoming meetings (similar to how doctors and dentists are now texting appointment confirmations) and providing quick case updates. For more detailed matters, send an email (or written attachment via email) but text to let the client know to check for it. If you get into a lengthy back-and-forth with a client about a case update, it may be best to set up a time to call them directly to discuss the matter in more depth.

As with other forms of communication, texts with clients should be preserved -- and, moreover, billed for. But unlike with email, no easy options yet exist that integrate text messaging with case management software for documentation and archiving. One option is to use Google Voice to send text messages to clients so that the date, time and other information about the message is preserved. Another is to document the text message exchange in a similar fashion to how you document phone calls for preservation and billing purposes.

Remember that text messages -- as well as posts in online chat forums, and content and messages shared on social networking sites such as LinkedIn and Facebook -- are written communications just as much as email or paper letters. Follow the same standards for professionalism, decorum and disclosure that you would if you were writing a memo or client letter.

Beyond emails and texts, more clients may be reaching out to you via social media such as LinkedIn or Facebook or on newer mobile-only platforms such as WhatsApp and Snapchat. The following bullet points offer some general advice to consider when engaging in these semi-public communication channels.

- Participate in LinkedIn, Facebook and other platforms for social networking to share general personal and professional information. Simply publishing a profile or page with information from your website, including contact information via email and phone, may be sufficient. The best practice for practitioners who have limited time for or interest in managing their social media is to maintain minimal public professional accounts on these services for client interactions and to avoid “friending” or otherwise connecting with clients on private personal accounts that are separate from your public identity. Another option is to use the law firm’s website as the holding place for biographical information, contact information, lists of journal articles and presentations and even a blog, if you choose. That way the updating of your information is handled in a centralized fashion and the law firm maintains control over the content as well as the branding.
- Make sure you or your staff members monitor these services as often as you do email in boxes to ensure that you do not miss any client communications. In most cases, the appropriate reply is to direct the client to contact you via email or phone call to discuss a

matter further. Conversely, if you do not have the resources to monitor an account on a social networking service or mobile app, it may be best to close or delete it. For example, commentators have suggested that a blog is only worth doing (for Search Engine Optimization, or SEO) if you are willing to provide new content at least every two weeks. Ask yourself whether obviously stale or outdated content actually detracts from the image you want to present.

- Be personable and upbeat in your online presence, even in private accounts. This is your “best self” that you want to project. Take care not to “overshare” or to tread into dangerous conversational waters, such as sharing intimate personal details, partisan opinions or negative content. Remember that an emailed screenshot from an offended “friend” is all that separates your private content from going public.
- Don't run afoul of rules regarding false advertising or “puffery.” Avoid specifically branding yourself an "expert" or "specialist" without checking with the bar association and legal ethics opinions in your state. (See Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 7.4. Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization)
- Avoid creating or sharing any content that could be construed as "practicing law" in other jurisdictions reachable via social sharing or Internet searches. Include a disclaimer in any online professional profiles that your communications sent via these channels do not automatically create an attorney-client relationship or necessarily constitute actionable legal advice. Although primarily concerned with non-lawyers providing legal services/legal advice, along with the technology to render this (LegalZoom), issues with respect to the unauthorized practice of law (UPL) are front-and-center at the American Bar Association as well as state bar associations.

- Avoid posting any location-aware content such as photos, geotagged updates or "check-in's when taking part in confidential meetings with clients, even if that content doesn't seem to relate to your discussion. Similarly, do not hint at or offer any details in status updates on social media that reference confidential client matters. A sharp-eyed observer may be able to piece together information from these posts that violates your client's privacy and confidentiality and may damage your case.
- Make sure that you establish clear boundaries in advance for your clients about the limits of their interaction with other parties to litigation and other legal matters via email, text messages, chat forums and social media. Coach them on what they can and can't post or reply about the legal matters in dispute. Caution them not to "friend" the judge or other officers of the court, or opposing counsel or other parties to the litigation.
- Be careful about "friending" judges, officers of the court and other attorneys and legal professionals on public accounts. While advisory opinions in many jurisdictions allow these interactions on a limited basis, the perception of bias may still occur in the minds of third-party observers. There are other concerns about friending clients, prospective clients and third parties and the lawyer is not allowed to misrepresent himself/herself or assume a false identity on social media as a way to gain trust or inveigle information from someone. In other words, what is not permissible in the real world vis-à-vis the ethical rules is also not allowed in the virtual world. While we might argue that being a "friend" on Facebook does not have the same level of personal connection and thus a chance of bias as a real-world friend, it is best to err on the side of caution and avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

- Don't seek client referrals directly from your followers on social media. It can be seen as pestering or, worse, violating professional prohibitions.
- Many online forums and closed discussion groups exist for attorneys in different practice areas and for “venting” about professional issues. Never assume that conversations that take place on websites or within apps such as Facebook will always remain private, even if your account or post is marked as such. Don't discuss current or prospective litigation in blogs, online forums or on social media. Don't share anything that risks waiving attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product or any of the confidentiality doctrines or otherwise violates professional ethics.
- Make sure that everyone you work with understands the rules of ethics regarding privacy and disclosure for social media and online posts. It is advisable for the law firm to have an Acceptable Use Policy that covers email, Internet, social media, etc. and that includes the right to monitor. In addition, a variety of professionals, such as paralegals and legal assistants, have their own codes of conduct that cover confidentiality. Moreover, under Rules 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, the lawyer has the duty to supervise not only employees of the law firm, but also any third-party vendors, consultants and contractors and would extend to website developers, law firm marketing companies, etc.
- As with email and text messages, when in doubt if a post or chat message is appropriate, the best practice is often not to send it.

Among the issues that an attorney needs to consider when “friending”, including for investigation someone (plaintiff, witness, judge) or for networking, are the duty of candor, *ex parte* communications and the appearance of impropriety. (Patrick, W.L. What are “friends” for? *California Lawyer*, Dec. 2011,

<https://ww2.callawyer.com/Clstory.cfm?eid=919354&wteid=919354> What Are Friends For?, accessed 10/29/15). Barone also discusses the need for care when “friending” between attorneys and judges. (Barone, P.T. Judges and lawyers must exercise caution as Facebook “friends”. *SADO: Michigan State Appellate Defender Office and Criminal Resource Center*, <http://www.sado.org/articles/Article/100>, accessed 10/29/15). Another issue may be whether there is a difference between various social media vendors. For example, the premise of LinkedIn and its overall content is intended for professional purposes while Facebook and other sites may tend to contain more personal information and perhaps less formality about the kinds of information that are shared and caution in making connections.

Further reading:

ABA Formal Opinion 10-457, "Lawyer Websites" (August 5, 2010). (Last accessed Oct. 21, 2015 at http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/2011_build/professional_responsibility/ethics_opinion_10_457.authcheckdam.pdf)

ABA Formal Opinion 11-459, "Duty to Protect the Confidentiality of E-mail Communications with One’s Client" (August 4, 2011). http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/YourABA/11_459.authcheckdam.pdf

ABA Formal Opinion 462, "Judges' Use of Electronic Social Networking Media" (February 21, 2013). (Last accessed Oct. 21, 2015 at http://www.americanbar.org/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/formal_opinion_462.authcheckdam.pdf)

Lackey Jr, M. E., & Minta, J. P. (2012). "Lawyers and social media: The legal ethics of tweeting, Facebooking and blogging." *Touro L. Rev.*, 28, 149. (Last accessed at http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/touro28&div=9&g_sent=1&collection=journals)

Christina Vassiliou Harvey, Mac R. McCoy, Brook Sneath. "10 Tips for Avoiding Ethical Lapses When Using Social Media," *Business Law Today*, American Bar Association, January

2014. (Last accessed Oct. 21, 2015 at http://www.americanbar.org/publications/blt/2014/01/03_harvey.html)

Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct R. 1.4 (2015). (Last accessed Oct. 21, 2015 at http://www.in.gov/judiciary/rules/prof_conduct/index.html#_Toc418253511)

James B. Kobak, Jr. & Ignatius A. Grande, Straight & narrow: social media ethics: keeping up with changing obligations. *ABI Journal*, Oct. 2015, pp. 20, 74-76.

Sharon D. Nelson & John W. Simek, Why Do Lawyers Resist Ethical Rules Requiring Competence with Technology?, Sensei Enterprises, Inc., May 4, 2015, <http://senseient.com/articles/why-do-lawyers-resist-ethical-rules-requiring-competence-with-technology/>, accessed 10/28/15 (See advice about encrypting email and for small law firms to avoid allowing employees to use personal devices to connect to the firm's network.)

Marian C. Rice. "Email Communications with Clients," Law Practice Magazine, American Bar Association, Vol. 39 No. 1, January/February 2013. (Last accessed Oct. 27, 2015 at http://www.americanbar.org/publications/law_practice_magazine/2013/january-february/ethics.html)

Matt Silverman. "How Lawyers Are Using Social Media for Real Results," Mashable.com, June 10, 2010. (Last accessed Oct. 21, 2015 at <http://mashable.com/2010/06/01/lawyers-social-media/#KcA9eGTMi05h>)

Tessie L. Smith, The digital handshake: how law students can protect their online identities and create a professional, personal brand online. *The Federal Lawyer*, Sept. 2015, pp. 8-10.

C. Managing Client Expectations

In addition to Rule 1.4 as included in Section A, Legal Ethics of Email, the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct feature Rule 1.3 on Diligence.

Indiana Rules of Court **Rules of Professional Conduct**

Including Amendments made through April 30, 2015,

http://www.in.gov/judiciary/rules/prof_conduct/prof_conduct.pdf, accessed 10/28/15.

A lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.

Comment

[1] A lawyer should pursue a matter on behalf of a client despite opposition, obstruction or personal inconvenience to the lawyer, and may take whatever lawful and ethical measures are required to vindicate a client's cause or endeavor. A lawyer must also act with commitment and dedication to the interests of the client. A lawyer is not bound, however, to press for every advantage that might be realized for a client. For example, a lawyer may have authority to exercise professional discretion in determining the means by which a matter should be pursued. See Rule 1.2. The lawyer's duty to act with reasonable diligence does not require the use of offensive tactics or preclude the treating of all persons involved in the legal process with courtesy and respect.

[2] A lawyer's workload must be controlled so that each matter can be handled competently.

[3] Perhaps no professional shortcoming is more widely resented than procrastination. A client's interests often can be adversely affected by the passage of time or the change of conditions; in extreme instances, as when a lawyer overlooks a statute of limitations, the client's legal position may be destroyed. Even when the client's interests are not affected in substance, however, unreasonable delay can cause a client needless anxiety and undermine confidence in the lawyer's trustworthiness. A lawyer's duty to act with reasonable promptness, however, does not preclude the lawyer from agreeing to a reasonable request for a postponement that will not prejudice the lawyer's client.

[4] Unless the relationship is terminated as provided in Rule 1.16, a lawyer should carry through to conclusion all matters undertaken for a client. If a lawyer's employment is limited to a specific matter, the relationship terminates when the matter has been resolved. If a lawyer has served a client over a substantial period in a variety of matters, the client sometimes may assume that the lawyer will continue to serve on a continuing basis unless the lawyer gives notice of withdrawal. Doubt about whether a client-lawyer relationship still exists should be clarified by the lawyer, preferably in writing, so that the client will not mistakenly suppose the lawyer is looking after the client's affairs when the lawyer has ceased to do so. For example, if a lawyer has handled a judicial or administrative proceeding that produced a result adverse to the client and the lawyer and the client have not agreed that the lawyer will handle the matter on appeal, the lawyer must consult with the client about the possibility of appeal before relinquishing responsibility for the matter. See Rule 1.4(a)(2). Whether the lawyer is obligated to prosecute the appeal for the client depends on the scope of the representation the lawyer has agreed to provide to the client. See Rule 1.2.

[5] To prevent neglect of client matters in the event of a sole practitioner's death or disability, the duty of diligence may require that each sole practitioner prepare a plan, in conformity with applicable rules, that designates another competent lawyer to review client files, notify each client of the lawyer's death or disability, and determine whether there is a need for immediate protective action. Cf. Ind. Admission and Discipline Rule 23, Section 27 (providing for court appointment of a lawyer to inventory files and take other protective action in absence of a plan providing for another lawyer to protect the interests of the clients of a deceased or disabled lawyer).

According to the 2013-2014 Annual Report of the Disciplinary Commission of the
Supreme Court of Indiana:

Ranked in order of complaint frequency, the alleged misconduct types most often giving rise to grievances are *Actions in Bad Faith, Communications or Non-Diligence, Improper Withdrawal, Not Acting With Competence, Improper Influence, Excessive Fees and Personal Misconduct*, with complaints about poor communications or non-diligence being close to one and a half times as frequent as the next category of alleged misconduct. (2013-2014 Annual Report of the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Indiana, p. 9, <http://www.in.gov/judiciary/discipline/files/1314-annrept.pdf>, accessed 10/28/15)

In terms of actual numbers, out of the 689 grievances filed with the Indiana Disciplinary Commission in 2013-2014, 155, or 22.5%, were for the alleged misconduct of communications/non-diligence. (*Id.* at Appendix D) The good news is that this is a reduction from the previous year as a percentage of total grievances filed (down from 27.28% in 2012-2013). On the other hand, a disturbing trend is a marked increase in the number of grievances filed for actions in bad faith, up from 1.09% of the total in 2012-2013 to 27.43% in 2013-2014. Eight grievances, representing 1.16%, were filed for disclosure of confidences in 2013-2014, along with 13 grievances (1.89%) for alleged misconduct in advertising. (*See also* Indiana Supreme Court Annual Report, 2014-2015, pp. 48-51.)

This problem can be readily addressed so that grievances for lack of communication and non-diligence are avoided. It is important to set expectations at the beginning of the representation about how often and under what circumstances the client will be contacted. In this world of television lawyers and instantaneous technology such as texts and email, clients may have a very unrealistic view about the speed of progress in a case. [N.B.: Professor Hook has the same problem in her role as a faculty member, especially since she teaches online courses. Students expect a nearly contemporaneous response.] Educating the client that this speedy resolution of disputes is not based in reality will be important. Also, a lawyer can use technology to provide communication to the client, such as regularly generated letters that are sent to the client that provide a general update about the case. General information about various legal matters for the public that is provided on the law firm's website may also be helpful. More technologically-savvy law firms may consider allowing the client to have access to certain materials. This resource is especially appropriate if the clients are sophisticated and if the cases more likely are focused on business-related matters rather than personal matters. The lawyer

may also want to set specific timeframes in which he/she is likely to return a client's phone call or respond to email. In the interests of confidentiality and avoiding the waiver of attorney-client privilege, the lawyer should discuss forms of communication with the client and the risks that some of these may pose (such as using an employer-provided computer network to send email to the lawyer or a fax machine in a public area). The client should indicate which method or methods of communication are going to be both accessible to the client and secure, so that confidentiality is preserved.

Email, the web and other information technologies can be convenient, save costs and make attorneys and their staffs more productive. For example, a great deal of law-related information, including cases, statutes and journal articles, is now available for free through the Internet as opposed to expensive legal research vendors. On the other hand, that same technology can result in reduced productivity if used improperly or to excess. Studies show that employees lose an inordinate amount of time because of personal use of email and web. Moreover, a number of companies have found themselves in a swirl of litigation when the employer's systems have been used to denigrate the company, to harass, stalk or discriminate against other employees or to misappropriate or share confidential or proprietary information. While it is impractical to totally forbid personal use of information technology, the law firm will want to have an Acceptable Use Policy that is reviewed in detail and signed by all employees as well as anyone else who has access to the law firm's systems. Included in the policy should be a statement that the law firm is allowed to monitor the use of its systems. Likewise, being stern with oneself about the time-wasting behaviors related to technology will help to minimize the distractions that email, the web and social networks can present. Not only does the attorney want

to model the behavior expected of staff, but nothing destroys morale as quickly as seeing that the rules do not apply to those at the top.

Before subscribing to listservs, blogs and RSS feeds, question whether these really add to your knowledge base and whether the contributors have the requisite expertise in the field or area of practice. Before you commit to blogging or providing podcasts, be sure that you will have enough time to provide a credible product on a regular basis. So much of what is retrieved through an Internet search is just one person's view without anything of a more substantial or scholarly basis. How often do you email back and forth with someone to make lunch plans when it would be simpler and quicker just to pick up the phone? Nelson, Calloway and Kodner suggest that before incurring any technology expense, we think about "time in a bucket" – and that the underlying question that should be posed is whether the technology will shift this time positively rather than negatively. (Nelson, S.D., Calloway, J.A. and Kodner, R.L. *How Good Lawyers Survive Bad Times*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, 2009). The same approach to "time in a bucket" can be applied to the use of technology. Surfing the web or viewing YouTube videos can provide helpful information, but it can also waste time. People spend an inordinate amount of time texting and posting information on social networking sites and then reading what others have responded. In terms of professional information, decide what is truly important to include on a biography on the law firm's website or your LinkedIn profile and then endeavor to make this as current and long-lasting as possible, either because the information will not change that often or can easily be updated. The time saved by avoiding these distractions can be better used to make certain that you are responding to client inquiries and communications in a timely manner and avoid a harried feeling by being bombarded with so much media content from so many sources that means that you are not as careful with using

communications technologies are you should be. The time that you save can also be used to investigate how you can use software and staff to streamline your operations so that routine communications can be handled more efficiently.

D. Notifying Court of Date Changes and Requesting Extensions

Often parties need to seek the continuance of a hearing or the continuance of a deadline due to a variety of circumstances. The applicable rules of procedure and/or the local rules of that court may describe the procedure for seeking that continuance or extension. Usually the procedure involves contacting the opposing counsel to obtain that counsel's consent to your request prior to filing the motion with the court. Should the opposing counsel not consent to your request, you note your efforts to contact the counsel and that the opposing party objects or at least does not consent to your request. If the opposing party consents to your request, you note that in the body (and sometimes in the title) of the motion. If the request for the continuance or extension is opposed, the court will decide if the request is appropriate and rule on the motion.

For example, the Local Rules of the Southern District of Indiana provide a procedure for requesting extensions of time (Local Rules, Effective 8/7/2015, <http://www.insd.uscourts.gov/local-rules>, accessed 10/28/15) in Rule 6-1 and for continuances in civil cases in Rule 16-3. Likewise, the Hamilton County Local Rules (<http://www.hamiltoncounty.in.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/61>, accessed 10/28/15) include LR29-TR00-205.30 regarding dates for trial settings and LR29-TR53-206 governing requests for continuances.

*Cori Faklaris is a graduate student in the Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI, in Indianapolis and is currently serving as Professor Hook's research assistant. She is a long-time journalist and communicator on social media who regularly

provides advice to non-profit organizations, companies and professionals on how to use online networking efficiently and for maximum impact.

Legal Ethics: Top Challenges



All rights reserved. These materials may not be reproduced without written permission from NBI, Inc. To order additional copies or for general information please contact our Customer Service Department at (800) 930-6182 or online at www.NBI-sems.com.

For information on how to become a faculty member for one of our seminars, contact the Planning Department at the address below, by calling **(800) 777-8707**, or emailing us at speakerinfo@nbi-sems.com.

This publication is designed to provide general information prepared by professionals in regard to subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional service. Although prepared by professionals, this publication should not be utilized as a substitute for professional service in specific situations. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

Copyright 2015
NBI, Inc.
PO Box 3067
Eau Claire, WI 54702

69762

Presenters

December 16 - Indianapolis

PROF. SARA ANNE HOOK is professor of informatics at Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI, where she has developed a suite of courses in the emerging field of legal informatics. She also has served as adjunct professor of law at the Robert H. McKinney School of Law, Indiana University, Indianapolis, where she has taught courses in intellectual property law and professional responsibility. Formerly, Professor Hook was associate dean of the faculties for IUPUI and head librarian at the IU School of Dentistry. She is admitted to practice in Indiana and before the Supreme Court of the United States. During law school, Professor Hook was executive notes editor of the *Indiana International & Comparative Law Review*, co-chair of the Dean's Tutorial Society, and finished second in the Client Counseling Competition. Her research interests include intellectual property law, the emerging field of legal informatics, and ways to enhance creativity in teaching and learning. Professor Hook is a member of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA), the Indiana State Bar Association, the International Legal Technology Association (ILTA), and of the Board of Governors of the Organization for Legal Professionals (OLP). She regularly publishes and gives presentations on intellectual property law, electronic discovery, legal technology, legal research techniques, and issues related to privacy and security. Professor Hook earned her B.A. and M.L.S. degrees from the University of Michigan; her M.B.A. degree from the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University; and her J.D. degree from the Robert H. McKinney School of Law, Indiana University, Indianapolis.

JUDY L. WOODS is a partner with the firm of Benesch Friedlander Coplan & Aronoff LLP, in the firm's litigation practice group. She focuses her practice on complex commercial and "bet the company" litigation, including antitrust, class actions, shareholder, and corporate governance disputes. Ms. Woods has represented several financial institutions and life/health insurance companies in complex litigation involving acquisitions and sales of financial or insurance companies or insurance company holding companies; ERISA matters; alleged securities or other violations related to the sale of annuities, debentures or other securities; and liquidation of financial institutions/insurance companies, holding companies, broker/dealers, and accounting firms in connection with these types of matters. Ms. Woods earned her B.A. degree from Macalester College; her M.A. degree from Bryn Mawr College; and her J.D. degree, cum laude, from Indiana University School of Law in Indianapolis. She is a member of the Indiana State Bar Association and the International Center for Dispute Resolution. Ms. Woods is an arbitrator with the American Arbitration Association on the Panel of Neutrals for Large and Complex Cases and Commercial Cases.

Table Of Contents

Lawyers and the Internet	1
Duties to Prospective Clients	27
Confidentiality and Data Security	41
Case Delays and Insufficient Client Communications	65
The Virtual Law Office	85
Conflicts of Interest	103