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Rules Prohibiting Fraud, Dishonesty, Deceit, or Misrepresentation

Prohibitions on lawyer dishonesty, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation are replete throughout every state’s rules of professional conduct. Most base their rules on the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, which prohibit dishonest and deceitful activity in a number of different provisions, including Rules 1.2 (Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority between Client and Lawyer), 4.1 (Truthfulness in Statements to Others), 4.4 (Respect for Rights of Third Persons) and 8.4 (Misconduct).1

In re Gatti. The leading case for our purposes regarding these issues is In re Gatti,2 a case out of Oregon dealing with a civil attorney (Gatti) falsely posing as a chiropractor. In an effort to conduct an investigation and acquire information for a possible lawsuit, Gatti contacted a company that employed chiropractors to conduct medical reviews. He represented himself as a chiropractor to both that company and one of the chiropractors whom they had employed in the past. This information came to the Bar’s attention, and he was investigated.

Gatti involved the Oregon rules similar to ABA rules 4.1 and 8.4(c), which prohibit a lawyer from making a false statement of law or fact. In this case, the Oregon Supreme Court held that Gatti’s misrepresentations were a violation of the prohibition on false statements of fact. The court concluded that by “misrepresenting his...identity and purpose when contacting someone who is likely to be adverse to the lawyer’s client,” Gatti had violated the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The decision quickly had a very broad impact because the Gatti Court specifically addressed situations in which prosecutors might hypothetically find themselves, broadly concluding that Oregon “does not permit recognition of an exception for themselves, broadly concluding that Oregon “does not permit recognition of an exception for any lawyer to engage in dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or false statements.”3

Out of a concern for ethical liability in supervising investigations, the Gatti decision “prompted federal prosecutors [in Oregon] to suspend all major federal undercover investigations” for a lengthy period of time.4 To remedy the situation and curtail the expanse of undercover investigations, the Oregon Supreme Court held that Gatti’s misrepresentations were a violation of the prohibition on false statements of fact. The court concluded that by “misrepresenting his...identity and purpose when contacting someone who is likely to be adverse to the lawyer’s client,” Gatti had violated the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The decision quickly had a very broad impact because the Gatti Court specifically addressed situations in which prosecutors might hypothetically find themselves, broadly concluding that Oregon “does not permit recognition of an exception for any lawyer to engage in dishonesty, fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or false statements.”4
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Unsuccessful attempts at contacting a lawyer, Pautler posed as a public defender on the phone with the suspect, and after a conversation (which was recorded) persuaded the suspect to surrender.

Unfortunately, Pautler failed to disclose his ruse to the suspect—or the suspect’s attorney—for a number of weeks. In fact, he was only forced to admit his role in the surrender after the defense attorney recognized Pautler’s voice on the recordings of the phone conversation. Because of Pautler’s initial deception—and particularly because of his failure to advise anyone of his part in the surrender—he was found in violation of Colorado’s Rule 8.4.

Attorneys Working for Federal Intelligence Agencies. There are a number of attorneys who work in an intelligence capacity for the federal government, particularly in the Washington, D.C. area. How do the ethical rules concerning dishonesty affect their conduct? This question has been addressed twice. In 2003, the Virginia Standing Committee on Legal Ethics issued an opinion which took on this issue. The question posed to the committee was whether “intelligence and covert activities of attorneys working for the federal government” were permissible under rule 8.4(c).5 As will be discussed below, Virginia amended their rule 8.4(c) after the Gatti case to prohibit dishonesty and misrepresentation only when it “reflects adversely on the lawyer’s fitness to practice law.”

As such, the committee advised that “when an attorney employed by the federal government uses lawful methods, such as the use of ‘alias identities’ and non-consensual tape-recording, as part of his intelligence or covert activities, those methods cannot be seen as reflecting adversely on his fitness to practice law” and, as such, are permissible.6

A similar question was presented soon thereafter to the Bar of the District of Columbia: do “‘attorneys who are employed by a national intelligence agency violate the Rules of Professional Conduct if they engage in fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation in the course of their non-representational duties?’”7 Looking to the purposes for which the rule was adopted, the opinion references the D.C. Court of Appeals, which indicated “its intention to limit the scope of Rule 8.4 to conduct which indicates that an attorney lacks the character required for bar membership,” not to every instance of dishonesty in which an attorney might engage.8 The conclusion reached by the D.C. Bar was that Rule 8.4’s prohibitions do not include “misrepresentations made in the course of official conduct as an employee of an agency of the United States if the attorney reasonably believes that the conduct in question is authorized by law.”9

Other Jurisdictions. Utah has given an opinion similar to D.C.’s approach, but also has acknowledged that there is very little precedent to support it.10 A government lawyer who participates in a lawful covert government operation that entails conduct employing dishonesty, fraud, misrepresentation or deceit for the purpose of gathering relevant information does not, without more, violate the Rules of Professional Conduct.11 Other jurisdictions, such as Michigan and...
Virginia, have solved the problem of prosecutors supervising undercover investigations by changing the wording of their rules to include language which explicitly limits ethical violations to conduct which reflects adversely on the lawyer's fitness to practice law.21

As of the time of this article, no jurisdiction has given any definitive guidance regarding the specific issue of whether a prosecutor can use dishonest or deceitful representations—either personally or through an agent in a supervisory capacity—in an undercover online investigation.22

If you have waded through the no-contact provisions and requirements for honesty and candor, now it is time to embark into the “special” responsibilities of prosecutors in the rules of professional conduct.

Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor

As a supplement to the remainder of the ethical rules applicable to all attorneys, state rules of professional conduct also outline special (or “additional”)20 responsibilities for prosecutors. Unfortunately, those prosecutorial responsibilities have very little, if anything, to do with the question at hand. Only two states even touch on the role of a prosecutor in the investigative stage of a case regarding issues such as contact with suspects.23 Without clear guidance from the rules of professional conduct in these “special” prosecutor sections, practitioners are left to rely on the interpretations from the other two broad categories of rules.24

Conclusion

As always, a prosecutor must be aware of the ethical constraints attached to being a practicing attorney: All attorneys are ethically obligated to comport their conduct to the rules of professional conduct, and prosecutors, not just supervising investigators making those misrepresentations.
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