### EXHIBIT 9

#### LOUISIANA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

#### IN RE:

# RE-EVALUATING LOUISIANA'S LAWYER ADVERTISING RULES PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing concerning the above captioned matter was held on Wednesday, the 8th day of November, 2006, at the Federal Courthouse in Lafayette, Louisiana commencing at 5:10 p.m.

Before: Lori Achee

Certified Court Reporter

State of Louisiana

#### MR. GAY:

25

We're all set to start? Good afternoon, my name is Phelps Gay. I'm an attorney from New Orleans and a member of the State Bar's Rules of Professional Conduct Committee, and we're here this afternoon to present and discuss and get as much feedback as we can on some proposals to revise our current Rules of Professional Conduct on the subject of lawyer advertising and solicitation. know that many, if not everyone, in this room is a member of the Louisiana Bar and so I won't detain you with too much background, but these Rules of Professional Conduct are promulgated by the Louisiana Supreme Court and, traditionally, the Bar Association assists the Court in the study and formulation of the Rules, and it is common, I believe, and appropriate for the Bar to reach out to everyone across the State, members of the Bar and members of the public to get as much information as we can and feedback as I say before we make any final decisions. So this is part of a process that is going on across the state. I think

/

it's the second of four public hearings.

One was conducted in Baton Rouge; we're in

Lafayette today. I believe other members of
the committee are going to New Orleans
tomorrow and then after that, to Shreveport.

So, we want to hear from you on these
proposed revisions to the Rules of
Professional Conduct.

Just a little bit of background information and then we're going to get into what these new proposals are and most importantly, your input and feedback on them, but -- and, I should say, I'm a member of the Rules of Professional Conduct Committee. I'm not the Chair of the committee, and we are joined here today -- Sam Gregorio of Shreveport, a very prominent attorney who is also a member of the committee and participating in the subcommittee which did a lot of hard work toward the drafting of the proposals that we have.

Quick background. We have had since 1994 Rule 7 of the Rules of Professional Conduct on lawyer advertising. It has been

24

25

revised once or twice since then. They were not part of the comprehensive review and revision of our Rules of Professional Conduct, which was called the Ethics 2000 process, which was conducted between 2000 and 2003, intentionally. We just thought that this subject deserved a separate consideration so they were not part of that consideration of the Rules and, of course, that process, Ethics 2000, reached it's final conclusion, and we do have those new revised rules.

There was, and Sam, jump in here if I'm saying anything incorrectly, but there has been some legislative initiative to visit and revise our Rules of Professional Conduct. I believe there was a Bill in the State Senate to revise the Rules which, I believe, the Bill also partook heavily from the Florida Rules of Professional Conduct. I want to say that State Senator Marionneaux may have been the proponent of that legislation.

In any event, as happens with that kind of process, it becomes necessary to move

2.

this subject to the attention of the
Louisiana Supreme Court because it is the
Louisiana Supreme Court that
constitutionally has the jurisdiction to
regulate the practice of law in the State of
Louisiana, and so as I appreciate it, while
that Bill met with a lot of support in the
legislature, ultimately, it was referred to
Louisiana Supreme Court.

Louisiana Supreme Court has it's own committee to study our current advertising rules which is different from this State Bar Committee that is conducting this public hearing today. And they have also asked our State Bar Committee to conduct a thorough study and review of the Rules and to conduct these public hearings such as we're conducting today, and the process will be that it'll move from the State Bar Rules of Professional Conduct Committee, I believe, to the Supreme Court Committee and, ultimately, it will be the decision of the Louisiana Supreme Court as to what to do.

So that's sort of how we got to be where we are, and I want to stress again that the

purpose of this is to explain the Rules, present the Rules.

There is, I believe, a CLE component of this that is available to members of the Louisiana Bar who wish to obtain CLE credit. But really, the main purpose is to get feedback so that we -- we're going to meet again in late November and we want to review and digest all of these topics.

Sam, is there anything else you need to add to that by way of background?

MR. GREGORIO:

The Senator and House of Delegates in between.

MR. GAY:

Absolutely. Thanks for reminding me.

The State Bar has a body as you know called the House of Delegates elected from districts all over the state, and the plan is for this proposal, in whatever form it is in at that time which will be in January of 2007, to be presented to and discussed and debated by the members of the House of Delegates of the Louisiana State Bar Association. So certainly nothing final

#### ASSOCIATED REPORTERS, INC. (337) 988-0556

<u>ک</u> <del>ک</del>

will happen at least until that debate has been carried out.

I guess I should introduce a couple people here today. We are joined by the person who is going to take us through the Rules, Richard Lemmler. Richard is sitting right here next to me, and he is the Ethics Counsel for the Louisiana State Bar Association and has provided invaluable assistance as we've reached this point; Billy King who's the Practice Assistant Counsel with the Bar is here today; Chuck Plattsmier, you all know, is the Chief Disciplinary Counsel; Frank Nuenor, former Bar President is here as well.

All that said, I guess I would like to turn the proceedings over. What's going to happen is, Richard is going to -- has a Power Point, and I think you already have materials that include the new proposals and their comparison with the current rules, and Richard is going to take us through what the proposals are in the Power Point, and I believe the plan is to stop whenever anyone wants to after we get to a particular Rule,

### ASSOCIATED REPORTERS, INC. (337) 988-0556

2.2

whether it's 7.1 or 7.1(a) or 7.2, and receive as much input as we can. Because if we just go through the whole thing, it's going to take a little while and people may be a little tired if we gobble up all the oxygen in the room for 45 minutes and then ask for comments. So we want to talk about it. We want to hear your comments on it, pro or con, as we go through. Richard, the floor is yours.

#### MR. LEMMLER:

Okay. Thank you. A couple little housekeeping things before I get started into the actual language of the Rules themselves. As you note on the slide, this is a public hearing. We do have a court reporter present. We're going to be transcribing your comments so we'd ask you for purposes of the record, for purposes of the committee, and perhaps the Supreme Court Committee when they get to look at these things, just state your name and whether you're a lawyer or not just so we know who's here whenever you have a comment, and I'll try to remind you if you don't remember.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Phelps said, there is CLE credit. You get an hour of Ethics credit for attending this. We'll give out the forms when it's over with, and you can get your course number and so forth. There is a sign up sheet up here. Anyone who came in after we got started, at some point before you leave, just make sure to sign in so we have a record that way of your attendance.

We'll go through it that way. And, as

All right. Proposed Rule Changes: An Overview of Proposed Rule Changes. first thing we have on the list is the Florida State Bar experience. That might, at first glance, seem like a tour of alcoholic beverage establishments in South Florida, but actually we're referring to the experience that the Florida State Bar might have with respect to these Rules, and that's primarily one of the reasons why we focused on that with this proposal that's based quite heavily on Florida's existing Rules dealing with advertising and solicitation. Florida's had some form of the current Rules for about 11 years now in place. In fact,

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

last week the have just revised their rules. So we're going to be looking at that as well, but for the most part, the rules and the framework that we use is Florida's for two reasons; one, because they have a history, they are working in Florida; two, because Florida has an 82-page handbook that they supply to all of their members as a quide to how to interpret the Rules, give you examples providing information, case law, etcetera, etcetera, everything you wanted to know about these Rules including the filing process that Florida has. We'll be getting into that in a minute. That's primarily where we got started.

As Phelps mentioned, there was a subcommittee of the Rules of Professional
Conduct Committee, the Bar Committee, that
started looking at this, I think, in mid2005. We started looking at the Florida
Rules, and it was a logical place. We
didn't want to really reinvent the wheel so
it was a good place to start. Quite
coincidentally, the State Legislature in
early 2006, the Bill that was passed in

State Legislature, also focused on the Florida Rules. So that was another reason why we stuck with what we have and that they're a pretty good set of Rules. If you look at the side-by-side comparison that we have available to you, you can see that the existing Rules that we had fit pretty nicely into the proposal. Nothing really was removed from what we currently had. That's the Florida experience. That's why we are here with the Florida Rules.

Review of Proposed Substantive Changes in Proposed Procedural Rules. Basically, what we did is break this down. There are two components to these Rules. It's easier to understand them in that form. They are basically the substance of changes; what you can and can not do, what you should and should not do and a procedural component that deals with the filing requirement and a review requirement. We will take those in that order.

Comparatively, we just did this little list so that you can see, you know, what we have now on the left and what we're

proposing on the right. Basically, we're doubling the amount of Rules that we have as far as the number, but, again, many of these titles, many of these topics, match up quite nicely with what we already have and, again, on a comparative list, you'll see that what we have now has fit into the proposal with almost no deletions.

Proposed Rule changes. Rule 7.1. What is generally permissible? Basically, a definition of the permissible forms of advertising and, again, as Phelps said, we thought it would be best for the committee and for the Court committee in going through these transcripts, if we just took it one Rule at a time and you stop me when you have a comment. I'm going to be reading and talking, but make sure you get my attention, and we'll put your comment on the record; good or bad.

Permissible forms of advertising.

Public media including print media,

telephone directory, legal directory,

newspaper, and other periodicals, the basic

stuff. Outdoor advertising such as

billboards and other signs, radio, TV, the more common and generally recognized forms of advertising. Computer access communications and that's subdivided later on. You'll see it's internet advertising, websites and email. Recorded messages can be publically accessed by dialing a telephone number, which I don't know is quite so common anymore, and written communication in accordance with Rule 7.4, and you'll see that in a minute. That's essentially what we're calling right now targeted written solicitation. What we have right now in our Rule 7.3. Yes, ma'am?

#### MS. BILLEAUD:

Susan Billeaud, attorney. Why is this necessary? Also, this seems to be pretty comprehensive. Is there any other form that I can possibly anticipate that a lawyer might be --

#### MR. LEMMLER:

I'm going to have to confer with the members of the committee on that because this is their prop. I'll see if any of the committee members present can comment to

with that respect. Sam?

MR. GREGORIO:

I think it's a question that -- MS. BILLEAUD:

Why is this necessary to alleviate with them? Is there some media that you anticipate that's on this list, and, you know, it wasn't necessary before?

#### MR. PLATTSMIER:

Chuck Plattsmier. This came directly from the Florida Rules, and this is part of their package about the types of advertising that the Rules were intended to address. If you look at the substance of the Rule itself, it says types of adverting you can engage in, included but not limited to. So if it says specifically included, but not limited to so that there's no question that the rules, the intent was to reach certainly these types that are recognized types of advertising. We would recognize it as the type of advertising, permissible forms of advertising.

MS. BILLEAUD:

Well, I didn't see that it's -- included

2.

but not limited to, but that doesn't pass it over just all advertising and not go through a list. I'm a little concerned about --

Richard, it might be helpful, at least from my perspective. We're trying to bring in comments and concerns that people may have. So any comment I think shouldn't be interpreted as an explanation for --

MS. BILLEAUD:

MR. PLATTSMIER:

This is just one of my concerns.

MR. LEMMLER:

Yeah. I think Chuck's point is very valuable. I certainly am not here to debate the merits of any of these Rules to you, just simply to try and explain what we have and to get your comments. Whether you like them or not and, certainly, if you have a question about it, or you think that this just doesn't make sense, please put that on the record, but we may not come back with a, "Well, no, this is great, you know, you've got like", and so forth.

MS. BILLEAUD:

I'm not really asking for argument. I

1 just really wanted to know if there was a 2. basis other than they did it in Florida. 3 You know what I'm saying? 4 MR. LEMMLER: 5 That, I think, was probably the basis 6 for this decision. Simply, we used the framework that they had and this is how they started. They give a basic definition of 8 9 what they consider to be potential 10 permissible forms of advertising. Not 11 necessarily exclusive for what's available. 12 More instructive, but your comments will 13 make. 14 MR. DURIO: 15 Well, I have a related question. In the 16 course of business, does anybody identify 17 any form of advertising that's not included? 18 MR. LEMMLER: 19 That's a great question. Can I ask you 2.0 to state your name for the record? 21 MR. DURIO: 2.2 Oh, I'm sorry. Buzz Durio. I'm a lawyer 23 here in Lafayette. 24 MR. LEMMLER: 25 I don't recall that anyone tried to

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS, INC.

(337) 988-0556

1 identify any other forms of advertising, and 2. certainly, if you can think of any at this 3 point, we'd love to hear about them and put them on the record. 4 MR. DURIO: 5 6 Well, I was just thinking and I can't think of any. I was going to ask you, I 8 asked you where does the magnet go? You 9 know, where does the magnet --10 MR. LEMMLER: 11 I suppose that's a form of written 12 communication. 13 MR. DURIO: Well, I'm just kidding. I was just 14 15 wondering if in the course of this, that any 16 identification of something that would not 17 be regulated? 18 MR. LEMMLER: 19 We have not heard of any at this point, 2.0 but again, if anyone has any ideas of 21 something else that they want to get 2.2 included, or they want on the list, 23 certainly speak up. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 25 I want to make a general comment. Ι

24

25

find the Rules extremely complex and all the cross references to sub-chapters and subsub-sub chapters and other regulations, not even contained here is going to be difficult to someone who wants to follow the Rules to follow the Rules. How would they get to I have something that says permissible forms of advertising and unless there's some form of advertising considered I mean, I keep reading the Rules in this. that are a permissible part in achieving, but constitutionally permissible in regulating. I am very much for rules, but I don't think the rules are directed to the heart. They are going after the people who are doing deceptive, trashy advertising. They degrade our profession and in many cases, bad handling. I don't think the rules should have a single word that's not necessary and list as a form of advertising of a single version.

#### MR. GREGORIE:

I believe the structural definition will articulate with that. Subsequently, one will say, we recognize it.

1	MS. BILLEAUD:
2	Why say that?
3	MR. GREGORIO:
4	Well, I think it's kind of a structural
5	definition for. 7.2.
6	MS. BILLEAUD:
7	I understand that point. I guess I
8	confer with Richard that perhaps it's a long
9	way around the truth, and maybe we can do
10	advertising in all types of whatever kind
11	you accept, you know, those that broadcast,
12	and it might just be straight forward. I
13	was very concerned about that when I saw
14	that. Can I ask another question?
15	MR. LEMMLER:
16	Sure.
17	MS. BILLEAUD:
18	What is the standard of review? Is it
19	narrowly tailored to get a controlling
20	government (inaudible)
21	MR. GREGORIO:
22	Florida (inaudible)
23	MS. BILLEAUD:
24	Has anyone read the Florida State Rules?
25	MR. LEMMLER:
	1990 St 1995 Depondence 1115

1 I have. MS. BILLEAUD: 2. I find them very straight forward. 3 4 MR. LEMMLER: 5 Okay, any other comments on that. 6 MR. BURGESS: Just a general comment. If I understand 8 you correctly, Florida has recently revised their rules. These are not revised rules; 9 10 is that right? 11 MR. LEMMLER: 12 No, sir. 13 MR. BURGESS: 14 I'm sure there's reason for possibly 15 litigation. If you can push that along with 16 the proposed handbook. It seems like we can 17 sit down and say this is a proposed rule. 18 These are the guidelines. There could be some benefit if we had guidelines, and if 19 2.0 you don't look at it, and you knew ahead of 21 time, you save some time. 2.2 MR. PLATTSMIER: 23 Chuck Plattsmier. Excellent point. 24 me tell you what my concern is. As I 25 recall, the Louisiana Legislature wrote the

24

25

handbook by agreement by resolution involved the Louisiana Supreme Court set a sunset provision or some sort of action to be The mechanism that would give us in compliance with that, we felt would also include, appropriately so, bringing in the Louisiana State Bar and House of Delegates. This meeting is, again, their agenda would be posted by mid-December. So you see the time table is backing us up based upon sort of a sunset provision that is sort of imposed by the legislative resolution. That's the first observation. Second, your point about the handbook is very valid. Many states utilize comments when they pass Louisiana Supreme Court has not generally embraced the notion that would impose these written comments. So for that reason, the handbook is a very important part of this. It may not make a lot of sense to you writing a handbook until we've got everybody's comments on the substantive rule. We want to make sure you have a handbook that matches that. Third, the revisions, as I understand it, came out

1

perhaps last week and probably at or around the time we had our very first hearing, and some of the changes are substantive. For example, I think that if you look at the recent part of the changes that they have chosen the board members to delete the disclaimer that every advertisement in every written form, which was the disclaimer that says selection of an attorney is an extraordinarily important decision and should not be made on the basis of advertising alone. That's part of the proposal. It's fashioned after Florida who has that provision. Those were sorts of things that was current.

#### MR. LEMMLER:

Follow up on something that Chuck said with respect to the handbook. I think from a practical standpoint, the handbook in Florida is 82 pages long. The comment before was the complexity of rules. Trying to cross reference this set of rules with an 82 page handbook is a monumental task. I know, I've done it twice already. So from a practical standpoint trying to come up with

a complete handbook as well as a complete set of proposed rules that you don't yet know whether they are actually going to be adopted in this form, it seems like putting the cart before the horse at that point. So there's every intention, I believe, at some point for the committee to get into the meeting of the handbook and a working handbook. I've already prepared a clean copy and a redline based on the proposal that we have now that we actually had an opportunity to look at, but we just don't have it for you now. That's in the works.

#### MR. HERNANDEZ:

You know, I haven't even really sat down and discussed this, but I can tell you two things that are going to interest me. One is the public comments; hopefully, they will be used in the House, because, you know, I can't go -- you know, all I know having talking to members whom I represented throughout the state not just in Lafayette, also I have an efficiency of lawyers in Lafayette who look upon the House and the 15th JDC and those who represent this area

21

2.2

23

24

25

and say, "John, what are the proposed changes?" The biggest concern for me is if we're going to go through each rule in the House, words like permissible, we could debate this. I don't have the knowledge that this committee who's put all the work and has done splendor job of performing what is a miraculous document. You have 144 members of the House who dedicate themselves to where we are, where we're going to be and the exact purpose of where we're going. The big question I have is, as often comes up, some of these rules are very easy, very explainable, they're not controversial. Some will be. Like this is a very controversial piece of legislation that the House is going to discuss. I have been in that house for six years. The simple question is, is this -- do we adopt all the rules, or we adopt none of the rules, or we adopt several of the rules that we like, you know, that's the issue because some of these rules that are very controversial, I can assure you, you're going to have a lot of Whether or not that can all be debate.

discussed, you know, in one afternoon at the House, I don't know, but I think from an aspect of the questions that I will be asked, it's simply is all or nothing or are some of these rules negotiable because I know the members of the committee will be there as well as those pushing this in both the Congress and the citizens who may have a different plight as far as what should be implemented regarding these rules. That's the procedural question I ask; is it all or nothing or is it negotiable?

#### MR. LEMMLER:

Well, I think to answer your question, there is rules of debate that was actually adopted by the House, I think it was last week, in the anticipation of this. It was pretty much echoed what was used for the Ethics 2000 revision, and then I think -- I believe it's an all or nothing so the House can vote it up or vote it down as a package as opposed to debating each individual item. I could be mistaken, but I think that's what the rules say.

MR. KING:

That's

Bill King. It is an all or nothing 1 2. thing, but there is a chance as I understand 3 it, to amend certain provisions of it with a 4 resolution 15 or 30 days ahead of time. 5 if you don't agree with a certain aspect of 6 these rules as they come out of the Louisiana State Bar Association and the Supreme Court Committee, you have a chance 8 9 to amend it, I think, at the House. 10 how it's agreed to work it through, Ethics 11 2000, correct? 12 MR. PLATTSMIER: 13 Yes. 14 MR. BROUSSARD: 15 Once it gets through the House, there 16 will be the recommendation to the Supreme 17 Court and of the committee? 18 MR. LEMMLER: 19 That's my understanding. That the Court 2.0 often would do whatever the Court wants to 21 do, but this is the recommendation from the 2.2 Bar with respect to the House. 23 MR. GAY: I wanted to respond to John's first 24 25 I believe I heard yesterday from question.

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

you all that the intent is to transcribe these public hearings and to put them in full, the transcripts, on the Louisiana State Bar Association website.

#### MR. LEMMLER:

That's correct. The transcripts -we're intending to put the full transcripts from each one of the hearings on the website. Right now, just to make a general announcement, if you don't know, all of these rules are on the Louisiana State Bar Association website right now. There is a public comment form online where anyone can log in. You do not have to be a lawyer. You do not have to be a member of this Bar to log in and register your comments. We're taking them. We're getting comments everyday. We're intending to also publish those comments on the same website. So you should be able to read online what everyone else is saying. So we're trying to make this as open and transparent of a process as we can given the time limitations that Chuck already referred to. So that information is there. If it's not yet, it will be.

other comments with respect to 7.1? We have a lot of rules to go through. These are all great comments, but I'm going to push ahead if no one has anything else to say with respect to this. 7.2. 7.2 is a huge -- yes, sir?

MR. GOFORTH:

Before you go on, I did not see the -MR. LEMMLER:

I'm sorry, can I ask you -MR. GOFORTH:

Bill Goforth, I'm from Lafayette.

MR. LEMMLER:

Thank you.

MR. GORFORTH:

I read these rules. It seems to me that there's a big hole in that area. I don't know if you've covered that, but we have national advertising by national law firms soliciting our citizens here in Louisiana. What is to prevent the same type of -- let's say siphoning off of a client based here in Louisiana to people advertising on a national basis who are outside the state that is soliciting our citizens? And, what

1	effect is that going to have if any?
2	MR. LEMMLER:
3	Anyone from the committee want to
4	comment on that?
5	MR. GREGORIO:
6	It's my understanding of the committee
7	is that each (inaudible) from advertising
8	(inaudible) is not intended to broadcast.
9	It is intended to be here.
10	MR. GOFORTH:
11	But a lawyer outside this state is not
12	subject to state laws.
13	MR. GREGORIO:
14	Where?
15	MR. GOFORTH:
16	In Texas. I mean, what do we have here
17	to prevent this kind of thing or is this
18	something not considered?
19	MR. GREGORIO:
20	You're talking about a Texas lawyer
21	trying to advertise in Texas?
22	MR. GORFORTH:
23	I'm talking about a New Jersey lawyer
24	advertising for in Louisiana on
25	television and soliciting our citizens
	ASSOCIATED REPORTERS, INC.

(337) 988-0556