1989

Are Some Lawyers More Equal than Others?

Sydney M. Cone III.
New York Law School, sydney.cone@nyls.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/fac_articles_chapters
Part of the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Commons, and the Legal Profession Commons

Recommended Citation
8 Int'l Fin. L. Rev. 16 (1989)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at DigitalCommons@NYLS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles & Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@NYLS.
serving for the seller complete control over the company's managerial policies.

The corporate charter must be modified prior to transfer of the usufruit interest, so as to define the rights attaching to the usufruit and nue-proprité interests as follows:

- usufruit carries the right to receive dividends, and no other rights;
- nue-proprité carries the right to vote on all decisions, ordinary (hence control of the board of directors and of dividend policy) and extraordinary (hence control of modifications of the company's capital and other decisions fundamentally affecting the company's legal identity or structure).

The usufruit can be transferred to the purchaser at the time of payment of the first instalment, and the nue-proprité can be transferred as it is paid for, up to a maximum of either 33 1/3 per cent or 49 per cent of the share capital. The seller's retention of 66 2/3 per cent of the company's capital would preserve for it the power to adopt both ordinary resolutions (which require the vote of a simple majority of the shareholders present or represented) and extraordinary resolutions (which require the vote of at least two-thirds of the shareholders present or represented). An ownership interest of 49 per cent would enable the purchaser to veto extraordinary decisions.

Contractually, the seller retains the right to repurchase all shares and usufruit rights previously transferred, in the event of default in payment of an instalment of the purchase price. In the event of such a repurchase, the seller will own a company that he has administered, with no risk of past mismanagement for the sake of maximising dividends or of other actions that might be incompatible with the seller's interests.

In this way, the purchasing managers can utilise the stream of dividends from the company to finance the purchase of the shares. The seller, who would otherwise be concerned that the managers might use their voting power to maximise dividends to the detriment of the company, determines the distribution policy of the company. Although the purchaser is dependent on the seller's voting to distribute dividends, failing which he may be forced to default, he is protected by the seller's interest in being paid in a timely fashion, which ensures that it will cause reasonable dividends to be distributed. In addition, this system enables him to purchase the company using limited personal resources.

The arrangement can extend over a long period: in extreme cases, a number of years equal to the multiple applied to annual profits to determine the value of the company. In such a case, the entire deferred part of the purchase price can be expected to be financed by dividends.

**Are some lawyers more equal than others?**

Reciprocity, by definition, is a two-way street. The EC must keep the traffic with the US flowing, argues Sydney M Cone III of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton, New York.

A number of major US law firms maintain offices outside the United States, generally in international centres where businessmen or bankers find it convenient to consult lawyers and where local professional rules have permitted US law firms to establish offices for the conduct of legal practice. London, Paris, Brussels and Hong Kong are notable examples.

In recent years, two events have focused attention on the issue of US reciprocity, that is, on the terms under which the United States permits lawyers from other countries to establish offices in the US. The first was the insistence by the US Government, as a matter of trade policy, that Japan authorise US law firms to open offices in Tokyo. The Japanese raised the issue of reciprocity and in 1987 concluded that sufficient reciprocity existed to justify the licensing of US lawyers to open offices in Japan.

The second of these events is the re-examination of the rights of US law firms in the European Community in the light of 1992. Because the US is not a member state of the EC, the point is sometimes made that US law firms should be accorded rights of establishment within the EC only if reciprocal rights exist in the US for EC law firms.

At the outset, it must be recognised that, for two fundamental reasons, a substantial measure of effective reciprocity is seen to exist in the US by US practitioners. First, the very openness of the US legal profession...
Reciprocity not required

A word on the New York legal consultant rules: they do not contain a reciprocity requirement. The New York Legislature and Court of Appeals considered whether to include such a requirement in the rules, and determined (a) that it would not be in the public interest to make the issuance of New York licences subject to restrictions obtained in other countries, and (b) that any definition of ‘reciprocity’ might be too elusive to be susceptible of meaningful application.

Because legal systems and the regulations of the legal profession vary widely from country to country, what constitutes reciprocity as between any two jurisdictions would rarely be self-evident, and enforcing reciprocity would involve the troublesome matter of obtaining affirmative evidence on the availability of reciprocal treatment in other countries. Rather than burden the licensing authorities with these issues, New York decided to forgo any reference whatever to reciprocity.

New York leads the way

Not unlike Paris, London, or Tokyo, New York City is the principal international legal centre in the US. In terms of US law firms alone (be they from New York or California or elsewhere), New York City is the country’s leading international centre. In the overwhelming majority of cases where non-US firms seek to establish US offices, they seek not a ‘US’ office nor an office in a ‘state’ but an office in New York City (indeed, in a single borough of that city). Viewed in terms of international legal centres, therefore, New York is not one state in a federal system; rather, it is the most important single place in the US for foreign lawyers to find liberal rules under which to be licensed.

As mentioned above, in June 1974, the New York Court of Appeals adopted its legal consultant rules to provide an alternative to Bar membership (authorized by an enabling statute enacted by the New York Legislature). The spirit of the legislative history and of the drafting of the resulting rules (the enactment of the enabling statute and the drafting of the rules had been closely coordinated) was to make New York hospitable to lawyers from abroad in order to foster the state’s development as an international centre for business, commerce, finance and law.

Under the rules, a lawyer from abroad (otherwise qualified) is entitled to be licensed, without examination, as a legal consultant authorised to ‘render legal services’ in New York, meaning all legal services not expressly forbidden by the rules. The principal restriction forbids a general practice before the courts (there is no restriction against handling administrative agency cases); there are also restrictions on engaging in a US conveyancing, testamentary or matrimonial practice.

The New York rules do not forbid a legal consultant to provide legal services in respect of the law of any jurisdiction. If, however, the legal consultant renders advice on US or New York law, he must do so ‘on the basis of advice’ from a member of the Bar. As will be seen, the legal consultant is entitled to employ, or to enter into association with, a member of the Bar. It is therefore not surprising that the New York offices of certain non-US firms comprise both legal consultants and members of the New York Bar. Of course, each legal consultant and member of the Bar is subject to the Code of Responsibility of the New York State Bar Association, and thus is subject to the Code’s requirement that a lawyer may not advise on a matter unless he is professionally competent to do so. The end result is the ability of the New York offices of these non-US firms to render advice delimited essentially by their professional competence.

The New York rules expressly authorise the legal consultant to use in New York the name of his firm in his country of origin. In practice, his firm usually opens and operates the New York office as an office of the firm, and (subject only to an unwritten rule of reason) as many or as few lawyers in that office obtain legal consultant licenses as the firm deems appropriate. To be licensed as a legal consultant, an applicant must have practised the law of his country of origin for five of the seven years preceding his application. The rules have been expressly liberalised to make it clear that, while the five years must comprise practice of the
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Partnerships

New York has thus generally permitted partner-
ships between its lawyers and lawyers from abroad
who are subject to the rules of recognised, organised
legal professions in their countries of origin. Of
course, the partnerships regulated by New York are
New York partnerships that admit foreign partners.
Here we have the question of a foreign firm associ-
ating itself with a member of the New York Bar. While
New York, as just discussed, may permit the associa-
tion, the rules governing the foreign firm in its home
country will also be relevant. Subject to those rules, a
foreign firm could enter into an association with
members of the New York Bar who themselves would
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Over a hundred licences have been issued to date
by New York to legal consultants from abroad. Since a
single licence can support a sizeable office of a non-US
firm the issued licences represent a great many
lawyers and law firms from foreign countries. In fact,
New York's status as a leading international legal
centre has been materially enhanced by the substan-
tial number of offices of major non-US law firms that
have been opened there over the years; and it seems
beyond doubt that the legislative purpose underlying
New York's legal consultant rules has been realised.
As already mentioned, every US jurisdiction is sub-
ject to the constitutional ruling of In re Griffiths that in
effect requires the admission of non-US applicants,
otherwise qualified, to the Bar. Following the adop-
tion of New York's rules, a total of nine jurisdictions,
in addition to complying with Griffiths, have also
authorised the licensing of legal consultants without
examination; a tenth US jurisdiction is reportedly
about to adopt legal consultant rules; and others may
well do so in the future.
The US jurisdictions with legal consultant rules, in
addition to New York, are Alaska, California, District
of Columbia, Hawaii, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Texas; at this writing, Wisconsin is expected to be
the tenth.
The California and New Jersey rules are identical to
New York's on the issue of reciprocity (see box p17); they do not mention it.
The District of Columbia, while generally following
the New York rules, deals with the practical substance
of reciprocity as follows:
'In considering whether to license an applicant
to practice as a Special Legal Consultant, the
court [DC Court of Appeals] may in its discre-
tion take into account whether a member of the
Bar of this court would have a reasonable and
practical opportunity to establish an office for
the giving of legal advice to clients in the appli-
cant's country of admission.... Any member of
the Bar who is seeking or has sought to establish
an office in that country may request the court to
consider the matter; or the court may do so sua
sponte'.

Matter of fact

This provision in the DC rules has the merit of deal-
ing with reciprocity neither as an abstraction nor as a
necessary prerequisite to licensing, but as a discre-
tionary and factual matter for consideration in appro-
priate cases, and then in terms of actual experience and
of 'reasonable and practical opportunity'. Alaska,
Hawaii, Michigan and Ohio have adopted the DC for-
mulation on reciprocity in their legal consultant rules;
and the proposed Wisconsin rules would also use the
DC approach.
As to permitted scope of practice, the DC rules are
similar to, though more specific, than the New York
rules. In DC the licensed legal consultant may advise
not only on non-US law but also on US (including
state) law if such US law advice is rendered 'on the
basis of advice' from a member of the Bar 'who has
been consulted in the particular matter at hand and
has been identified to the client by name' (the final 19
words do not appear in the New York rules). Hawaii,
New Jersey and Ohio have adopted this DC formul-
aison on scope of practice; and the proposed Wisconsin
rules would also adopt it.
In Alaska, California, Michigan and Texas, the
licensed legal consultant may advise only on the law
of non-US jurisdictions.
In an age when even professionals use the jargon of
market access it seems appropriate to observe that
lawyers from outside the US enjoy effective access to
the US market for their services. To the extent that they have gained this access by becoming fully fledged members of the Bar in the US, they have done so in a manner as to which effective reciprocity does not exist outside the US. To the extent that they have gained this access under legal consultant rules, they have done so under US rules that, for the most part, have either purposely refrained from inquiring into questions of reciprocity (as in New York, New Jersey and California), or have deliberately limited such inquiry to the applicable facts in those discretionary situations where circumstances may call for reciprocity (as in DC, Michigan, Ohio, Hawaii and Alaska).

Against this background, the member states of the EC, mindful both of their own firms' access to the US market and of the establishment of US law firms in Europe, can weigh the degree of effective reciprocity afforded EC lawyers in the US. Having done this, the member states could reach one of three conclusions.

First, the member states could conclude that the US, viewed as a whole, measures up to the level of reciprocity required for post-1992 Europe. Such a conclusion would obviously lay the issue of reciprocity to rest in a manner acceptable to the US.

The second possible conclusion for the member states would be the opposite of the first. Whatever the consequences of such a negative conclusion, it could be expected to invite an exchange of the type classically engaged in by differing parties who do not share a consonant view of reality.

A third possibility would be to take a Japanese-type approach (or a variation thereof) toward reciprocity. Under a Japanese-type approach, the US, viewed as a whole, would be deemed to comply with the EC's reciprocity requirements, but the right to establish law offices in the member states would be limited to US law firms whose principal offices were in the US states that had adopted legal consultant rules. (The variation might be to limit the right to US law firms whose principal offices were in certain of the US states that had adopted legal consultant rules).

For Europe, however, a Japanese-type approach may prove less feasible than for Japan. In 1987, both Japan and the US were writing on a relatively clean slate; Japan had just enacted its first post-Occupation law for the licensing of foreign lawyers; and no Japanese law firm had yet sought to open an office in the US. The EC and the US are in a decidedly different posture, and must deal with the acquired rights and future expectations of law firms on both sides of the Atlantic that have established offices on the other side. In short, the member states, in developing their post-1992 policy toward US law firms, may decide to consider reciprocity in the context of mutual EC and US concern for their respective law firms' overseas operations.

**Legal practice in Europe**

John Tulumin, QC, leader of the UK delegation to the CCBE and a practising barrister, explains how EC law applies to lawyers active within the single market

The recent upsurge of interest in European law and practice is not surprising. The 1992 Programme with its 279 Directives will deal with such areas of substantive law as competition, dumping, financial services, reinsurance, product liability, company law, telecommunications and free movement of goods and services including the professions. On the most practical level, all lawyers in Europe will have to be conversant with EC law to ensure that it is fully taken into account in advice which they give to their clients.

**Overriding principle**

However, the greatest change taking place in legal practice is in the mobility of lawyers. Throughout the EC, lawyers are looking to set up offices or form links with lawyers in other member states. Article 3(c) of the Treaty of Rome makes it clear that the Community intends to abolish obstacles to the freedom of movement of persons, services and capital between member states, in particular discrimination on the grounds of nationality. This overriding principle has to be kept in mind in considering the legal framework for the practice of law in the EC and in construing the later provisions of the Treaty which deal specifically with rights of establishment and provision of services by lawyers. The Treaty provides the framework for the practice of law by nationals from the member states. It does not deal with the rights of other lawyers, from eg the US or Japan, to establish themselves or to set up branch offices in EC countries.

A qualified EC lawyer can either provide legal services in another member state by visiting on an occasional basis (ie by providing services under Articles 59-66 of the Treaty) or by setting up a permanent establishment (ie by establishing an office under Articles 52-58). He may provide the legal service using his own home qualifications (under home title) or by obtaining an additional qualification from the place where he is established (as an integrated lawyer). Unless he is an integrated lawyer, he will be prevented from undertaking activities specifically reserved to full members of the local legal profession. In the UK this is confined to appearing in court on his own and to undertaking probate and conveyancing work.

In practice this gives foreign lawyers great freedom. Most wish to give legal and commercial advice to their clients and this they can do without restriction. There are well over 100 foreign law firms established in London, and they play an important part in maintaining...