GET INVOLVED

Do you have ideas about what the committee should focus on? Would you like a panel of experts to talk about the issues you’re dealing with in your practice as a U.S. lawyer abroad or a foreign legal consultant in the U.S.? Would you like to read about a specific topic in the committee newsletter? Send an email with your proposal to ramona.tudorancea@loebsmith.com.

Monthly Calls

Sometimes you would like to speak during the monthly call, but it’s difficult to do it with so many participants. Maybe you would like to introduce yourself and your practice or submit a new business to the attention of the committee. This newsletter is intended to provide a new opportunity for members to connect and contribute.

Introductions:

Send a brief description or your practice and yourself and your contact details, as well as any topics you would be particularly interested in, or projects you could contribute to. If you would like an opportunity to speak about something during a monthly call, we could make it happen.

Suggestions:

Do you feel that a topic deserves more attention? Do you have useful information about the practice of law in a certain country, or issues related to ethics, CLE credits, or conflicting requirements from your home country and where you actually practice? Make a suggestion, or even better, write out something to share with your fellow committee members!

Your ideas and your point of view are valued.

OUR STORY AS A COMMITTEE

LAC is the hybrid of two ABA-SIL committees with their own history, values and members. To move forward successfully, the committee members need to be reconnected with their past. Invitations are sent to committee members to come forward with their stories about when and why they joined, and their past experiences. In this first issue, an in-depth discussion by David Hopper and Linda Murnane is published in page 4.
THE FUTURE OF THE COMMITTEE

The ABA-SIL Spring 2018 annual conference committee breakfast in New York on 20 April 2018 was an opportunity for old and new members to connect and share their ideas about the future of LAC.

Highlights

• LAC continues its merger of predecessor committees (US Lawyers Abroad Committee and the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee). The discussion focused on the shared goals of helping members licensed in one jurisdiction and residing in another. Issues to be addressed include the regulation of authorized practice, the reconciliation of applicable rules of ethics and professional responsibility, and bureaucracy affecting practitioners in their host jurisdictions. **LAC will continue efforts to reach out to all members to canvass their specific interests, concerns, and challenges to practice.**

• Senior committee members remarked on their desire to assist with future programming ideas. **New and old members are encouraged to join our monthly calls and share ideas.** Ours has been an award-winning committee in part because of an earnest desire to help members bring their interests and concerns to the fore.

• Finally, the discussion turned to LAC’s desire to inspire through Community Outreach. Members discussed ideas on what to do in future Section meetings. Past years involved serving meals at soup kitchens and missions, giving blood, speaking to ESL and students from low-income families, and, most recently, a visit to the Cornelia Connelly Center for middle-school girls, who proved remarkably curious about what international lawyers do. See the discussion and pictures in page 3 of this issue!

WELCOME HOME; PLEASE LEAVE YOUR ELECTRONIC DEVICE WITH US

This LAC-sponsored panel was an outstanding success at the ABA-SIL Spring 2018 annual conference in New York.

**Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 10:15 AM – 11:45 AM:** “Welcome Home: Legal Ethics at the Border When Government Agents Pull You Aside and Ask for Your Laptop and Cellphone”

This panel was co-sponsored by the International Employment Law Committee.

**Chair & Panel Moderator:** Carolyn Knox, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C., San Francisco, CA

**Panel Chair & Speaker:** Bruce Horowitz, Paz Horowitz Abogados S.A., Quito, Ecuador

**Guest Speakers:** Esha Bhandari, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, NY; Guillermo S. Christensen, Brown Rudnick LLP, Washington, DC; Anthony Paccione, NYCBA Professional Ethics Committee, New York, NY; Cynthia Pree, Office of the Deputy Associate Chief Counsel for Customs and Border Protection, New York, NY
For the committee members who missed it, a summary of the debates and a description of the panel is included below. The introductory speech by Bruce Horowitz is also available in page 7.

Whether or not you are a U.S. citizen, any time you cross a border into the U.S., the U.S. Government has authorized its border agents to stop you on the entry gangway, and ask you to temporarily hand over, and give them the access codes to, your digital devices. For lawyers, that usually means handing over access to your clients’ confidential information, attorney work product, secrets and private data. What you do at that point can affect your clients’ lives and your own professional future. In this program, four attorneys, who are deeply involved in issues surround warrantless border searches, spoke and answered audience questions during this well-attended event. The audience learned what is actually happening in warrantless borders searches of digital devices, and why; the legal arguments on both sides of the warrantless border search issue; what lawyers can do and should do to protect their clients’ information during the search; and what lawyers should or must do to avoid the invasion of their clients’ privilege and constitutional rights during and especially before the border search takes place.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

On 16 April 2018, as part of our Community Outreach program, LAC organized a visit to Cornelia Connelly Center in New York City, a school for girls up to 8th grade (ages 8 to 14). The purpose of the visit, which was led by Cecilia Barrero, was “to empower each of the girls to fulfill all their potential and to make them understand the importance of being bilingual”.

Photos of the Cornelia Connelly Center visit, © LAC 2018
LAC committee members were invited to participate in the school’s monthly assembly, where some of the girls received awards for their determination, efforts at school or for team-playing. Later, the girls were divided into groups of 8 to 10, at different ages and each LAC committee member participating to the visit was assigned to one of the groups. Even if over 80% of the girls speak Spanish at home, none were comfortable with using their native language during the visit, but rather felt more comfortable speaking English.

“It was quite a challenge for some of us to connect with them at the beginning, but after a while, conversation started to become interesting, they ended asking a lot of questions about life in general and being bilingual in particular. It was a great experience, the teachers were really happy about us being there and we enjoyed it a lot.” - Cecilia Barrero.

In order to improve future visits to this kind of audience (taking account of their age), it was suggested in the future to prepare some kind of engaging activity or game, for LAC committee members be able to interact with children more fluidly. **Ideas welcome!**

**OUR STORY AS A COMMITTEE**

*David Hopper and Linda Strite Murnane*

David Hopper serves as Co-Vice-Chair for Rule of Law. Colonel Linda Strite Murnane (U.S. Air Force, Retired) is the Vice-Chair for Year in Review (YIR), in addition to service on several other committees across the ABA. Linda currently serves as the Chief, Court Management Services Section at the Special Tribunal for Lebanon located in Leidschendam, The Netherlands.

Last year the American Bar Association Section of International Law merged the U.S. Lawyers Abroad Committee with the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee, forming the “Lawyers Abroad Committee”. While this may seem a fairly insignificant change to some, it actually represents the changes being experienced in the global market place and the impact this has on the legal profession.

**U.S. Lawyers Abroad**

Some graduates of U.S. law schools have migrated their practice of law to the international setting. This usually happens gradually, as young lawyers develop their careers. However, there are plenty of opportunities for experience directly out of law school. Some of the examples of the types of law practice which might take U.S. lawyers abroad include service on active duty, with the National Guard or the Reserves, with the U.S. Armed Forces. Also among the U.S. lawyers serving abroad are Department of Defense, Department of Justice, U.S. State Department and other career civil servants. These individuals provide legal services in a wide range of areas, including issues related to U.S. policy, international relations, criminal prosecution, legal assistance, labor law (both domestic and international), claims, including Foreign Claims Act and other domestic claims, contracts, domestic relations, and other areas of practice.

Other members of the legal profession who received their J.D., LL.B., or LL.M. degrees through U.S. law schools may be performing services as international civil servants. These attorneys may serve clients in areas such as international criminal law at international tribunals like the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals, the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, the International Court of Justice, the US-Iran Claims Tribunal, European Court of Human Rights, or similar international institutions. Despite the U.S. not having signed the Rome Statute, some U.S. licensed attorneys perform legal services with the International Criminal Court. Some are engaged in legal practice with international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Doctors Without Borders and others. Other legal, rule of law, policy, analyst, and related positions even include working for thousands of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) like NATO, the World Bank, and the United Nations.

Another group of attorneys serve as in-house counsel for corporations with international footprints or clients. The nature of the work performed by these counsel, serving as expats in foreign countries are determined by the scope of the law firm’s client requirements.

Many members of the Committee are law students who have an interest in international law practice, with some even taking leadership roles within the Committee. The Lawyers Abroad Committee provides these students and established lawyers a great opportunity to network and
learn more about the various ways in which U.S. legal training can be put to use in a foreign jurisdiction.

Some members of the U.S. Lawyers Abroad Committee were individuals with law practices in the U.S. who also held licenses in foreign jurisdictions. For instance, Anand Dayal, a veteran member of the Committee and currently serving as a General Steering Group Member, explains the intersectionality of his work in both the United States and India:

“Having a US JD and being licensed in both jurisdictions positions me to add value in a unique way. Much of what I do for clients can if taken apart be done by either a US lawyer or an Indian lawyer. But there is a part that cannot be “unbundled”, which part is what adds the greatest value. My involvement at the intersection of two legal regimes is exciting and provides some wonderful opportunities to make a real difference. Although our law firm and my practice focusses on corporate clients, I find it deeply satisfying and rewarding to also serve individual clients—usually US citizens visiting India who are in need of help.”

Another veteran member of the newly combined committee is George Kounoupis, the Co Vice-Chair for Programs in the Lawyers Abroad Committee, who practices law both in the U.S. as well as Greece. His experiences and comments mirror that of Anand, and really shines the spotlight on how the merger of the two committees truly reflects a growing trend in the international practice of law. George brings his knowledge and professionalism to complex problems than can arise in situations with two different legal systems. George stated that while he practices in both countries, it is not efficient or cost effective to do routine appearances or filings in Greece. He therefore relies on English-speaking Greek lawyers that he affiliates with under a joint venture agreement. While George does visit Greece every three months, he is in constant-contact with his colleagues and clients via Skype, conference calls, emails, and other communication tools that enhance his ability to run a global law-practice. George further explained various examples of intersectionality in his international practice below:

“My ability to see a case from both legal sides is very useful. For example, on one day I may be explaining to U.S. lawyers that a Greek trial is more like a U.S. summary judgment argument. On another day I may be explaining to Greek lawyers what a U.S. trust [entails]. Or I may be explaining to a US real estate investor that Greece has no deeds in the way we understand them. I may be telling a divorcing spouse that Greek laws apply which is different than U.S. law as to the property distribution. I may be explaining to a business the Greek capital controls on banking regulations.”

Foreign Legal Consultants

Another area of U.S. licensed attorneys who practice abroad are those functioning as foreign legal consultants. Foreign legal consultants may have slightly varying requirements based on the locality, but essentially, they are licensed lawyers or a recognized legal professional in good standing in a foreign country that choose to register and practice in another country. Some countries only practice of a foreign lawyer in that country if there is full reciprocity. Within the U.S., the individual state bar associations govern how foreign legal consultants can legally work as lawyers within their confines. New York, Texas, and California are examples of states that allow such activity.

A perfect example of why merging the U.S. Lawyers Abroad Committee with the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee makes sense considering a continued global awareness and growth of transnational practice of law, is the work of Brigitte Gambini. Formerly, separate efforts were made by the respective committees to assist U.S. lawyers working outside of the U.S. and foreign lawyers working inside the U.S. Brigitte was one of the leaders in the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee and remains a Representative of the Paris Bar in New York. Her work with the Paris Bar led to an increased appreciation of the capability of Foreign Legal Consultants within the United States and fosters continued growth and cooperation between foreign and U.S. legal markets. As one of the Co-Chairs to the newly merged Lawyers Abroad Committee, Brigitte is now able to help bridge the efforts between the US Lawyers Abroad Committee activities and the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee activities to open cultural and legal understanding of lawyers wanting to practice bilaterally in the global market.

Obviously, specific laws governing the operations of foreign lawyers will vary. Laurence Weiner, the Co Vice-Chair for Programs in the newly merged Lawyers Abroad Committee, stated that the Lawyers Abroad Committed has extensively examined this key issue for years and acknowledges a lack of uniform answer and expresses a word of caution.
Laurence, who works in Argentina and the U.S., reminds us that lawyers working abroad may have to navigate issues of ethics and professional responsibility designed for that jurisdiction that may not be as stringent as the U.S. For example, Laurence stressed that although there may be no basis in Argentine law to apply California rules of ethics he generally will. Additionally, Laurence points out lawyers “must be extremely careful to avoid the unauthorized practice of law, which means—first and foremost—the avoiding of giving advice on laws outside his or her qualifications.”

One instance of how continued trust and openness between differing jurisdictions creating opportunities to expand practice for all lawyers is the relationship between France and the U.S. Ramona Tudoranca is the Publications Vice-Chair for the Lawyers Abroad Committee and a practicing lawyer in New York and France. Ramona stated that although she does not have a JD, her LL.M from Columbia Law School in New York allowed her to shorten the time necessary to obtain her qualifications in France. “Because I was already qualified in the US, I was able to skip the long and convoluted process currently existing in France, [which can include] a first exam, then lessons with the Bar School for 6 months, then clerkship/internship for another 6 months, then the final Bar exam.” Ramona explained that as long as a candidate could pass the French Bar exam, in French of course, then using the European Union’s laws and freedoms of services rule, one could potentially practice in other European countries.

The challenges relating to the ethical practice of law and the practical challenges of policing the international legal practitioner are among issues regularly discussed by the combined committee. Since these challenges can vary as widely as any matter of policy and law, membership in Lawyers Abroad Committee offers an outstanding opportunity to compare how these challenges intersect national boundaries.

Ecuador, for example, has no specific law or regulation governing foreign legal consultants according to Bruce Horowitz, another veteran member of the Lawyers Abroad Committee who is currently serving as a General Steering Group Member. Bruce, who practices in Ecuador and the U.S., says the government is strict on who may provide legal services. Bruce stated, “The practice of law is limited to lawyers who have Law Degrees recognized by a government entity, with the acronym, SENECYT, and who have been granted a license to practice law by the Consejo Nacional de la Judicatura.” According to Bruce, only those licensed lawyers may represent clients in any legal proceeding or give legal advice, including any arbitration or mediation. Bruce was emphatically behind the merger of the U.S. Lawyers Abroad Committee and the Foreign Legal Consultants Committee when he stated the merger “is a natural consequence of the internationalization of commerce and communications, [and it] will strengthen the work of both groups and enrich their members.”

Combining the U.S. Lawyers Abroad Mission and the Foreign Legal Consultants Missions in one ABA Committee

For years, the ABA Section of International Law has placed the lawyers in the categories described, as well as others not included in the brief descriptions above, in different committees. This year, however, the ABA Section of International Law, after consultations with leadership of each of the committees, combined these two entities into a single organizational entity, intended to provide better service to all the members of the ABA Section of International Law serving abroad.

There were many reasons supporting the decision to combine the two committees. The purpose and charter of the new “Lawyers Abroad Committee” is to:

“... [serve] the needs and interests of U.S.-licensed lawyers who work or are interested in working outside the United States. Committee programs and initiatives include CLE programming to fulfill state bar CLE requirements, ad hoc programs of special interest to our members, initiatives to improve the practice of law outside of the U.S. and networking opportunities for U.S.-licensed attorneys residing abroad.”

Among the many areas this committee will work on collaboratively under the new committee structure are working toward open market opportunities for U.S. lawyers who are or wish to practice abroad. The committee also explores the challenging area relating to ethics for lawyers whose practice involves an international client base, or U.S. clients who work abroad. The committee has already established a history of working on key policy issues which impact many in the international law practice, including the former U.S. Lawyers Abroad Committee’s work on the House of Delegates Resolution co-sponsored with the Europe
Committee which addressed the need to modernize the Model Notarial Act to reflect the realities of today’s cross-border transactions and real-life practice in the business world.

Carolyn Knox and Beatrice Raccanello, two of the Co-Chairs of the Lawyers Abroad Committee offered these reflections about the value of combining the committees. Carolyn emphatically summed up the issue when she stated:

“We are pleased USLAC and FLC are now combined as there is a natural affinity and allied interests between the two groups. Many of our members are both US-qualified lawyers and foreign legal consultants in the jurisdictions where they currently reside. Combined we will continue our focus on issues, such as the notarization initiative and continuing a dialog with jurisdictions that are generally closed to foreign practitioners. Together our committees will have a stronger voice!”

Beatrice Raccanello also reconfirmed the reasoning behind the move to merge the two committees when she stated:

“As an LLM graduate and NY attorney with a JD from Italy who lives in the US, I understand the issues that both FLC and USLAC face. On one side, foreign lawyers who come to the US and want to register as foreign legal consultants face practice limitations depending on which state they reside in. On the other side, US lawyers and non-US lawyers who practice in a foreign jurisdiction other than the US face even more difficult barriers to practice abroad. Therefore, there is an indisputable synergy between the two committees: the common purpose to break barriers to legal service. In fact, both FLC and USLAC have been working separately on several programs to liberalize legal services around the world. Working together in the new unified committee (Lawyers Abroad Committee) would allow us to better achieve this goal and continue to promote programs that enhance dialogue among jurisdictions within the US and around the world.”

To highlight the benefits of the now-combined committee, the Lawyers Abroad Committee has organized materials which are available for ABA Section of International Law members to review. The current structure of the committee has something for everyone.

In the end, Ramona Tudorancea summarized the value of this merger nicely when she stated:

“The value of LAC is thus twofold: (a) to help US and foreign lawyers connect over mutual “human” values and create a global lawyer mindset – promoting democratic and human values irrespective of country or the areas of practice; and (b) help US and foreign lawyers navigate the complexity of the current globalized world, where lawyers are often called to work in cross-border matters raising a host of various issues, from anti-corruption and economic sanctions, to various ethics rules, to various cultural issues. I believe that LAC should take on a larger role because of that, but that LAC should not be in competition with other committees but rather focus on cooperation and support. The merger with the foreign consultants committee should give us the perfect opportunity to grow in the right direction.”

“How does it feel to be on your own” when border agents ask for access to the information in your electronic devices?

© Bruce Horowitz

At this panel presentation, you will be listening to and interacting with four attorneys with long experience in the legal, organizational and technical aspects of the limited powers of the government to gather information without a warrant; the 1st Amendment, 4th Amendment and Privacy rights of U.S. Citizens, Residents and others people entering the United States of America; and the obligation of attorneys to protect their clients’ confidential information.

This short paper is about all lawyers’ ethical obligation to protect the confidential information of their clients. While we all have a sense of the Lawyer Ethics Rules concerning attorney-client privilege, this paper takes you one step away from the minutia of those rules and interpretations of how to respond to information requests from government officials under different circumstance.
This paper will, hopefully, allow you to see how you might feel in the shoes of others (non-lawyers in each case, and the shoes of one lawyer in the position of “client” in one case), who truly believed that they had an ethical obligation to protect their “client” (or be protected) against demands for access to information by government officials.

For a Domestic Violence Counselor

In the winter of 1980, the wind and snow were howling outside the State Court House in Juneau, Alaska. Inside the court, a young woman was standing before Judge Tom Stewart. The young woman was a counselor at the A.W.A.R.E. Shelter for Victims of Family Violence, the first such shelter in the State. Judge Steward had supported the enactment of the recent State Law to protect women and children in domestic violence situation, but at this moment, he was asking the young woman who counseled victims of domestic violence to repeat what her client had told her in confidence at a counseling session about certain violent acts allegedly committed by the victim’s husband.

This domestic violence counselor was standing before the court rather than sitting in the witness stand because she been brought to court for refusing to testify in a criminal trial against the battering victim’s husband. As in many states, Alaska prohibited forcing one spouse to testify against the other spouse, so the District Attorney had chosen to subpoena the spouse’s domestic violence counselor instead.

Judge Steward had already asked her two times. This was the third and final time the Judge would ask her to repeat what her client had told her in a counseling session at the women’s shelter. The Judge was telling her that if she did not answer, then she would be imprisoned until she did tell.

The howling wind outside could not be heard over the silence in the courtroom.

The domestic violence counselor then repeated for the third and last time that confidentiality was necessary for victims of domestic violence so that they could speak all of the truth to their counselors in order for the psychological healing to begin for the battered victim and her children. In this case, the victim had refused to authorize the counselor to repeat or describe the victim’s story. The counselor said that she could not divulge what her client had said to her in confidence.

After a few more moments of silence, Judge Stewart said that the counselor’s desire to protect her client, and that to stick to her vow to protect client confidences was commendable, but that the law of the State of Alaska did not obligate a domestic violence counselor to protect her client’s information even for the worthy purpose of the psychological health of the victim and her children, nor did the law recognize a battered victim’s right to confidentiality in communication with a domestic violence counselor. Therefore, with great sadness (which was obvious to anyone in the court room), the judge ordered the bailiff to take the counselor to the waiting pen for transport to jail.

A Nurse

On September 1, 2017, a hospital nurse, Alex Wubbles, was attending to an unconscious and severely wounded patient at a hospital in Salt Lake City, Utah, when a police officer entered the hospital and asked to have a blood sample drawn from that patient. Under the hospital’s patient protection rules a blood sample could only be provided based on a warrant or under a few other specified circumstances. The officer did not have a warrant, nor were the other specifications met, and the nurse read the hospital policy to the officer before refusing to allow the police to secure a blood sample without the consent of the patient. The police officer then forcibly arrested the nurse. In the video link, the reader may vicariously experience what it felt like to fulfill her obligation to protect her patient’s confidential information.

Two Reporters

On May 3, 1998, the Cincinnati Enquirer began publishing a series of articles by two investigative reporters, Mike Gallagher and Cameron McWhirter, about questionable business practices by an American agro-business company in Latin America. The American company sued the newspaper; and Mr. Gallagher was indicted for theft of voicemail messages.

In 1999, Mr. Gallagher testified in court, that “protecting a confidential source was ‘one of the highest responsibilities a journalist has.’”

Perhaps because Mr. Gallagher had lied to his editors about how he was personally entering the company’s
voice mail system to collect the information, he decided to negotiate with the prosecutors; and he pleaded guilty on two counts of stealing voicemail messages. He provided the grand jury with the name of his confidential news source, an American lawyer who had worked for the company in Latin America and the United States, and who had provided the Mr. Gallagher with access to the company's voicemail system.

The former company attorney, who was one of Mr. Gallagher’s confidential news sources, was indicted on 10 counts of providing illegal access to the voice-mail system.

Despite prosecutorial threats of indictment, the other reporter, Mr. McWhirter, who had had contact with other confidential sources, refused to identify any of his confidential news sources for the story. As Mr. McWhirter later wrote for the Columbia Journalism Review,

“The special prosecutor wanted me to do something simple: sign a piece of paper agreeing to waive Ohio’s shield law. Doing so would require me to disclose confidential sources with whom I had spoken during the yearlong investigation. He made clear that the risks of not cooperating were great, and threatened to indict me on unspecified charges. I could lose my job; I could go to jail, he said. I must fully cooperate and waive the shield law or he would come after me. His threats, for a while delivered hourly in telephone calls to my lawyer, ranged wildly. He claimed he was going to prosecute me for being a co-conspirator of some kind.

My challenge was in that room with the chain-smoking special prosecutor. The question was not what journalist was I going to become, but what journalist was I at that moment. In this life, we learn about what we really believe not when things go well, but when they go wrong. I learned in that room that I would face jail rather than discuss confidential sources.”

The three real-life situations, above, did not involve attorney-client privilege, for which attorneys in all U.S. States and in many countries have State Bar or Supreme Court obligations to protect. In some countries, like Ecuador for instance, it is a crime for a professional to divulge a client’s confidential information, if that information could harm the client.

A question for any attorney is how courageous one must be in protecting the confidential information of a client’s, or perhaps all of one’s clients’ confidential information in the case of a border warrantless laptop search. As courageous as a domestic violence counselor? a nurse? or a reporter? Or is there something in the obligation of an attorney that allows for handing over all the recorded communications on a laptop of all of one’s clients to a border agent without a warrant? Or is there some middle ground?
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