

not required to disclose information gained by the judge while serving as a member of a committee that renders assistance to ill or impaired judges or lawyers or while serving as a member of a bar association professional ethics committee or the Judicial Branch Committee on Judicial Ethics.

COMMENTARY: Disciplinary measures may include reporting a lawyer's misconduct to an appropriate disciplinary body. The judge who receives this information still has discretion to report it to the appropriate authority, depending on the seriousness of the conduct and the circumstances involved.

(4) A judge, in the exercise of the judge's power of appointment, should appoint on the basis of merit, should avoid favoritism, and should make only those appointments which are necessary. A judge should not approve compensation of appointees beyond the fair value of services rendered.

COMMENTARY: Appointees of the judge include officials such as referees, commissioners, special masters, receivers, guardians and personnel such as clerks, secretaries, and bailiffs. Consent by the parties to an appointment or an award of compensation does not relieve the judge of the obligation prescribed by this subdivision.

(5) A judge shall not knowingly advocate or knowingly participate in the appointment, employment, promotion or advancement of a relative in or to a position in the judicial branch. For purposes of this subdivision, relative means grandfather, grandmother, father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister.

AMENDMENT NOTES: The above change relieves a judge who receives information while serving on the Judicial Branch Committee on Judicial Ethics from the affirmative duty to report misconduct.

(No changes are proposed to the remainder of this Canon.)

Rule 8.3. Reporting Professional Misconduct

(a) A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects, shall inform the appropriate professional authority. A lawyer may not condition settlement of a civil dispute involving allegations of improprieties on the part of a lawyer on an agreement that the subject misconduct not be reported to the appropriate disciplinary authority.

(b) A lawyer who knows that a judge has committed a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct that raises a substantial question as to the judge's fitness for office shall inform the appropriate authority.

(c) This Rule does not require disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6 or General Statutes § 51-81d (f) or obtained while serving as a member of a bar association ethics committee or the Judicial Branch Committee on Judicial Ethics.

COMMENTARY: Self-regulation of the legal profession requires that members of the profession initiate a disciplinary investigation when they know of a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Lawyers have a similar obligation with respect to judicial misconduct. An apparently isolated violation may indicate a pattern of misconduct that only a disciplinary investigation can uncover. Reporting a violation is especially important where the victim is unlikely to discover the offense.

A report about misconduct is not required where it would involve violation of Rule 1.6. However, a lawyer should encourage a client to consent to disclosure where prosecution would not substantially prejudice the client's interests.

If a lawyer were obliged to report every violation of the Rules, the failure to report any violation would itself be a professional offense. Such a requirement existed in many jurisdictions but proved to be unenforceable. This Rule limits the reporting obligation to those offenses that a self-regulating profession must vigorously endeavor to prevent. A measure of judgment is, therefore, required in complying with the provisions of this Rule. The term "substantial" refers to the seriousness of the possible offense and not the quantum of evidence of which the lawyer is aware. A report should be made to the bar disciplinary agency unless some other agency, such as a peer review agency, is more

appropriate in the circumstances. Similar considerations apply to the reporting of judicial misconduct.

The duty to report professional misconduct does not apply to a lawyer retained to represent a lawyer whose professional conduct is in question. Such a situation is governed by the Rules applicable to the client-lawyer relationship.

Information about a lawyer's or judge's misconduct or fitness may be received by a lawyer in the course of that lawyer's participation in an approved lawyers or judges assistance program. In that circumstance, providing for an exception to the reporting requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of this Rule encourages lawyers and judges to seek treatment through such a program. Conversely, without such an exception, lawyers and judges may hesitate to seek assistance from these programs, which may then result in additional harm to their professional careers and additional injury to the welfare of clients and the public.

AMENDMENT NOTES: The above change relieves lawyers who receive information while serving on a bar association ethics committee or the Judicial Branch Committee on Judicial Ethics from the affirmative duty to report misconduct.