Duty to Avoid Conflicts of Interest

3.4-1 A lawyer shall not act or continue to act for a client where there is a conflict of interest, except as permitted under the rules in this Section.

Commentary

[1] As defined in rule 1.1-1, a conflict of interest exists when there is a substantial risk that a lawyer's loyalty to or representation of a client would be materially and adversely affected by the lawyer's own interest or the lawyer's duties to another client, a former client, or a third person. Rule 3.4-1 protects the duties owed by lawyers to their clients and the lawyer-client relationship from impairment as a result of a conflicting duty or interest. A client's interests may be seriously prejudiced unless the lawyer's judgment and freedom of action on the client's behalf are as free as possible from conflicts of interest.

[2] In addition to the duty of representation arising from a retainer, the law imposes other duties on the lawyer, particularly the duty of loyalty. The duty of confidentiality, the duty of candour and the duty of commitment to the client's cause are aspects of the duty of loyalty. This rule protects all of these duties from impairment by a conflicting duty or interest.

[3] A client may be unable to judge whether the lawyer's duties have actually been compromised. Even a well-intentioned lawyer may not realize that performance of his or her duties has been compromised. Accordingly, the rule addresses the risk of impairment rather than actual impairment. The expression "substantial risk" in the definition of "conflict of interest" describes the likelihood of the impairment, as opposed to its nature or severity. A "substantial risk" is one that is significant and plausible, even if it is not certain or even probable that it will occur. There must be more there a mere possibility that the impairment will occur. Except as otherwise provided in Rule 3.4-2, it is for the client and not the lawyer to decide whether to accept this risk.

Personal Interest Conflicts

[4] A lawyer’s own interests can impair client representation and loyalty. This can be reasonably obvious, for example, where a lawyer is asked to advise the client in respect of a matter in which the lawyer, the lawyer’s partner or associate or a family member has a material direct or indirect financial interest. But other situations may not be so obvious. For example, the judgment of a lawyer who has a close personal relationship, sexual or otherwise, with a client who is in a family law dispute is likely to be compromised. The relationship may obscure whether certain information was acquired in the course of the lawyer and client relationship and may jeopardize the client’s right to have all information concerning his or her affairs held in strict confidence. The relationship may in some circumstances permit exploitation of the client by his or her lawyer.

[5] Lawyers should carefully consider their relationships with their clients and the subject matter of the retainer in order to determine whether a conflicting personal interest exists. If the lawyer is a member of a firm and concludes that a conflicting personal interest exists, the conflict is not imputed to the lawyer’s firm, but would be cured if another lawyer in the firm who is not
involved in such a relationship with the client handled the client’s work without the involvement of the conflicted lawyer.

Current Client Conflicts

[6] Duties owed to another current client can also impair client representation and loyalty. Representing opposing parties in a dispute provides a particularly stark example of a current client conflict. Conflicts may also arise in a joint retainer where the jointly represented clients’ interests diverge. Acting for more than one client in separate but related matters may risk impairment because of the nature of the retainers. The duty of confidentiality owed to one client may be inconsistent with the duty of candour owed to another client depending on whether information obtained by the lawyer during either retainer would be relevant to both retainers. These are examples of situations where conflicts of interest involving other current clients may arise.

[7] A bright line rule has been developed by the courts to protect the representation of and loyalty to current clients. c.f. Canadian National Railway Co. v. McKercher LLP, [2013] 2 S.C.R. 649. The bright line rule holds that a lawyer cannot act directly adverse to the immediate legal interests of a current client, without the clients’ consent. The bright line rule applies even if the work done for the two clients is completely unrelated. The scope of the bright line rule is limited. It provides that a lawyer cannot act directly adverse to the immediate legal interests of a current client. Accordingly, the main area of application of the bright line rule is in civil and criminal proceedings. Exceptionally, the bright line rule does not apply in circumstances where it is unreasonable for a client to expect that the client’s law firm will not act against the client in unrelated matters.

[8] The bright line recognizes that the lawyer-client relationship may be irreparably damaged where the lawyer’s representation of one client is directly adverse to another client’s immediate legal interests. One client may legitimately fear that the lawyer will not pursue the representation out of deference to the other client, and an existing client may legitimately feel betrayed by the lawyer’s representation of a client with adverse legal interests. This type of conflict may also arise outside a law partnership, in situations where sole practitioners, who are in space-sharing associations and who otherwise have separate practices, hold themselves out as a law firm and lawyers in the association represent opposite parties to a dispute.

[9] A lawyer should understand that there may be a conflict of interest arising from the duties owed to another current client even if the bright line rule does not apply. In matters involving another current client, lawyers should take care to consider not only whether the bright line rule applies but whether there is a substantial risk of impairment. In either case, there is a conflict of interest.

Former Client Conflicts

[10] Duties owed to a former client, as reflected in Rule 3.4-10, can impair client representation and loyalty. As the duty of confidentiality continues after the retainer is completed, the duty of confidentiality owed to a former client may conflict with the duty of candour owed to a current
client if information from the former matter would be relevant to the current matter. Lawyers also have a duty not to act against a former client in the same or a related matter even where the former client’s confidential information is not at risk. In order to determine the existence of a conflict of interest, a lawyer should consider whether the representation of the current client in a matter includes acting against a former client.

Conflicts arising from Duties to Other Persons

[11] Duties owed to other persons can impair client representation and loyalty. For example, a lawyer may act as a director of a corporation as well as a trustee. If the lawyer acts against such a corporation or trust, there may be a conflict of interest. But even acting for such a corporation or trust may affect the lawyer’s independent judgment and fiduciary obligations in either or both roles, make it difficult if not impossible to distinguish between legal advice from business and practical advice, or jeopardize the protection of lawyer and client privilege. Lawyers should carefully consider the propriety, and the wisdom of wearing “more than one hat” at the same time.

Other Issues To Consider

[12] A lawyer should examine whether a conflict of interest exists not only from the outset but throughout the duration of a retainer because new circumstances or information may establish or reveal a conflict of interest. For example, the addition of new parties in litigation or in a transaction can give rise to new conflicts of interest that must be addressed.

[13] Addressing conflicts may require that other rules be considered, for example

(a) the lawyer’s duty of commitment to the client’s cause, reflected in Rule 3.7-1, prevents the lawyer from withdrawing from representation of a current client, especially summarily and unexpectedly, in order to circumvent the conflict of interest rules;

(b) the lawyer’s duty of candour, reflected in Rule 3.2-2, requires a lawyer or law firm to advise an existing client of all matters relevant to the retainer. Even where a lawyer concludes that there is no conflict of interest in acting against a current client, the duty of candour may require that the client be advised of the adverse retainer in order to determine whether to continue the retainer;

(c) the lawyer’s duty of confidentiality, reflected in Rule 3.3-1 and owed to current and former clients, may limit the lawyer’s ability to obtain client consent as permitted by Rule 3.4-2 because the lawyer may not be able to disclose the information required for proper consent. Where there is a conflict of interest and consent cannot be obtained for this reason, the lawyer must not act; and

(d) rule 3.4-2 permits a lawyer to act in a conflict in certain circumstances with consent. It is the client, not the lawyer, who is entitled to decide whether to accept risk of impairment of client representation and loyalty. However, Rule 3.4-2 provides that client consent does not permit a lawyer to act where there would be impairment rather than merely the risk of impairment.
These rules set out ethical standards to which all members of the profession must adhere. The courts have a separate supervisory role over court proceedings. In that role, the courts apply fiduciary and other principles developed by the courts to govern lawyers’ relationships with their clients, to ensure the proper administration of justice. A breach of the rules on conflicts of interest may lead to sanction by the Law Society even where a court dealing with the case may decline to order disqualification as a remedy.

Consent

3.4-2 A lawyer shall not represent a client in a matter when there is a conflict of interest unless there is consent, which must be fully informed and voluntary after disclosure, from all affected clients and the lawyer reasonably believes that he or she is able to represent each client without having a material adverse effect upon the representation of or loyalty to the other client.

Commentary

Disclosure and consent

[1] Disclosure is an essential requirement to obtaining a client’s consent and arises from the duty of candour owed to the client. Where it is not possible to provide the client with adequate disclosure because of the confidentiality of the information of another client, the lawyer must decline to act.

[2] Disclosure means full and fair disclosure of all information relevant to a person’s decision in sufficient time for the person to make a genuine and independent decision, and the taking of reasonable steps to ensure understanding of the matters disclosed. The lawyer therefore should inform the client of the relevant circumstances and the reasonably foreseeable ways that the conflict of interest could adversely affect the client’s interests. This would include the lawyer’s relations to the parties and any interest in or connection with the matter.

[2A] While this rule does not require that a lawyer advise a client to obtain independent legal advice about the conflict of interest, in some cases the lawyer should recommend such advice. This is to ensure that the client’s consent is informed, genuine and uncoerced, especially if the client is vulnerable and not sophisticated.

[3] Following the required disclosure, the client can decide whether to give consent. As important as it is to the client that the lawyer’s judgment and freedom of action on the client’s behalf not be subject to other interests, duties or obligations, in practice this factor may not always be decisive. Instead, it may be only one of several factors that the client will weigh when deciding whether or not to give the consent referred to in the rule. Other factors might include, for example, the availability of another lawyer of comparable expertise and experience, the stage that the matter or proceeding has reached, the extra cost, delay and inconvenience involved in engaging another lawyer, and the latter’s unfamiliarity with the client and the client’s affairs.