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**Re: Chapter 32 Amendments:**

**Comment Letter Opposing Proposed Amendment Rule 32:8.4(g),**

**page 33, lines 44-46; page 34, lines 1-46; page 35, line 1**

Dear Justice Wiggins, Justice Appel, Justice Waterman, Justice Mansfield, Justice Christensen, and Justice McDonald:

This comment letter is filed pursuant to the Court’s Order of August 1, 2019, seeking public comment on several proposed rules. This letter opposes adoption of the proposed amendment to Rule 32:8.4(g) and its accompanying comments (page 33, lines 44-46; page 34, lines 1-46; and page 35, line 1).

Proposed Rule 32:8.4(g) is drawn verbatim from the widely criticized ABA Model Rule 8.4(g), proposed by the ABA in 2016. After three years of deliberations in many states across the country, only two states have adopted this defective rule. In contrast, at least eleven states have concluded, after careful study, that ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) is both unconstitutional and unworkable. I respectfully request that the Court reject Proposed Rule 32:8.4(g). It would seem prudent to take the course of waiting to see whether other states choose to experiment with ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) and the practical effect of that experiment on the lawyers in those states.

This is particularly true when current Rule 32:8.4(g) already makes it professional misconduct to engage in sexual harassment and unlawful discrimination. Moreover, current Comment [3] that accompanies Rule 32:8.4(d) already deems bias and prejudice in the course of representing a client to be professional misconduct if the conduct is prejudicial to the administration of justice.

A number of scholars have characterized ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) as a speech code for lawyers.[[1]](#footnote-1) The late Professor Ronald Rotunda, a highly respected scholar in both constitutional law and legal ethics, warned that ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) threatens lawyers’ First Amendment rights.[[2]](#footnote-2) Regarding the new rule, he and Professor John S. Dzienkowski wrote, in the 2017-2018 edition of *Legal Ethics: The Lawyer’s Deskbook on Professional Responsibility*, “[t]he ABA’s efforts are well intentioned, but . . . raise problems of vagueness, overbreadth, and chilling protected speech under the First Amendment.”[[3]](#footnote-3) Professor Michael McGinniss, Dean of the University of North Dakota School of Law, raised similar concerns in a recent article.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Two Arizona practitioners thoroughly examined ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) and concluded that it “is riddled with unanswered questions, including but not limited to uncertainties as to the meaning of key terms, how it interplays with other provisions of the Model Rules, and what disciplinary sanctions should apply to a violation; as well as due process and First Amendment free expression infirmities.”[[5]](#footnote-5) They recommend that “jurisdictions asked to adopt it should think long and hard about whether such a rule can be enforced, constitutionally or at all.” And they conclude that “the new model rule cannot be considered a serious suggestion of a workable rule of professional conduct to which real world lawyers may be fairly subjected.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

Since the ABA adopted Model Rule 8.4(g) in August 2016, the United States Supreme Court has issued two major free speech decisions that demonstrate its unconstitutionality. First, under the Court’s analysis in *National Institute of Family and Life Advocates v. Becerra*, 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018), Model Rule 8.4(g) is an unconstitutional content-based restriction on lawyers’ speech. In *Becerra*, the Supreme Court held that state restrictions on “professional speech” are presumptively unconstitutional and subject to strict scrutiny. Second, under the Court’s analysis in *Matal v. Tam*, 137 S. Ct. 1744 (2017), ABA Model Rule 8.4(g) is an unconstitutional viewpoint-based restriction on lawyers’ speech that cannot survive strict scrutiny.

In the past three years, various official entities in Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas have rejected or abandoned ABA Model Rule 8.4(g). Only Vermont and New Mexico have adopted it.

Iowa attorneys should not be subject to a rule that has not yet been adequately tested in other states. I respectfully request that the Court reject Proposed Rule 32:8.4(g) and thank the Court for considering these comments.

Yours truly,
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