PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE
ON LEGAL ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
and
PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION PROFESSIONAL GUIDANCE COMMITTEE
JOINT FORMAL OPINION 2024-200

ETHICAL ISSUES REGARDING THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence ("AI") has fundamentally transformed the practice of law by revolutionizing various aspects of legal work. AI-powered software can perform legal research, contract analysis, and document review tasks, saving time and increasing efficiency. AI can also help predict legal outcomes, manage cases, and automate routine tasks. AI technology has facilitated the automation of routine legal tasks, allowing legal professionals to focus on higher-value work requiring human expertise and judgment.

Generative AI has taken the advances of AI even further. It can assist lawyers by automating document drafting, preparing summaries, analyzing and synthesizing large volumes of documents and other information, optimizing efficiency, and allowing for more focused attention on legal strategy and client needs.

In short, the use of AI has gone from something in movies to an everyday tool in the practice of law. This technology has begun to revolutionize the way legal work is done, allowing lawyers to focus on more complex tasks and provide better service to their clients.

To attorneys, the thought of using AI to draft pleadings and briefs and review documents may seem unfamiliar and even intimidating because the technology is relatively new, and many attorneys have not used it. Now that it is here, attorneys need to know what it is and how (and if) to use it.

The use of AI has also raised ethical issues for attorneys. Topics such as client confidentiality and competence in the use of AI are at the forefront of our day-to-day legal practices. As outlined in more detail in the "Guidance & Best Practices for the Use of Artificial Intelligence" section below, this Joint Opinion is intended to educate attorneys on the benefits and pitfalls of using this type of technology, and provide ethical guidelines, including:

- Lawyers must ensure that AI-generated content, such as legal documents or advice, is truthful, accurate, and based on sound legal reasoning, upholding principles of honesty and integrity in their professional conduct.

- Lawyers must be competent in the use of AI technologies.

- Lawyers must ensure the accuracy and relevance of the citations they use in legal documents or arguments. When citing legal authorities such as case law, statutes, regulations, or scholarly articles, lawyers should verify that the citations accurately reflect the content they are referencing.

- Lawyers must safeguard information relating to the representation of a client and ensure that AI systems handling confidential data adhere to strict confidentiality measures.

- Lawyers must be vigilant in identifying and addressing potential conflicts of interest arising from using AI systems.

- Lawyers must communicate with clients about their use of AI technologies in their practices, providing clear and transparent explanations of how such tools are employed and their potential impact on case outcomes.

- Lawyers must ensure that AI-related expenses are reasonable and appropriately disclosed to clients.

- Lawyers must engage in continuing legal education and other training to stay informed about ethical issues and best practices for using AI in legal practice.

The rapid growth of AI is forcing the legal profession to confront and adapt to it. As with other forms of technology, from cloud computing to virtual offices, these new technologies implicate old ethical problems. This opinion will clarify how our existing ethical rules impact the proper use of this technology.

The Committees also emphasize that lawyers must be proficient in using technological tools to the same extent they are in employing traditional methods. Whether it is understanding how to navigate legal research databases, use e-discovery software, use their smartphones, use email, or otherwise safeguard client information in digital formats, lawyers are required to maintain competence across all technological means relevant to their practice.

Definitions of Artificial Intelligence

1. Artificial Intelligence

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines "artificial intelligence" as "software used to perform tasks or produce output previously thought to require human intelligence, esp. by using machine learning to extrapolate from large collections of data."[1]

The National Artificial Intelligence Act of 2020 defines "artificial intelligence" as "a machine-based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations or decisions influencing real or virtual environments; abstract such perceptions into models through analysis in an automated manner; and use model inference to formulate options for information or action."[2]

2. Generative Artificial Intelligence

Although artificial intelligence has been used for decades, generative AI represents a significant change and a dramatic step forward in legal applications, because instead of only analyzing content, it can also generate new content. McKinsey and Company explain that "Generative artificial intelligence (AI) describes algorithms (such as ChatGPT) that can be used to create new content, including audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos."[3]

Generative AI and large language models are like two peas in a pod. Generative AI is the brain behind creating new output, including text, images, and music, by learning from existing data. Of particular concern is the type of generative AI, which, unlike its predecessors, is used not only to analyze data but also to create novel content. Generative AI creates this content using large language models, in which a model is "trained" on vast amounts of data, rendering it able to generate new content by referring back to the data it has ingested. The release of OpenAI's ChatGPT in November 2022 ushered in this new era of technological development.

Artificial Intelligence's Application for Lawyers

AI has already been used for many years in various legal software applications including document review, legal research, and document assembly. Generative AI differs from non-generative AI because it creates content, and it is the creation of content that necessitates heightened awareness by lawyers.

For example, document review software has enabled Technology-Assisted Review ("TAR") of large document collections, sometimes referred to as "predictive coding" or "computer-assisted review." The Sedona Conference defines TAR as "A process for prioritizing or coding a collection of electronically stored information using a computerized system that harnesses human judgments of subject-matter experts on a smaller set of documents and then extrapolates those judgments to the remaining documents in the collection. … TAR systems generally incorporate statistical

---

[1] https://www.oed.com/dictionary/artificial-intelligence_n

[2] 15 U.S.C. 9401(3).

[3] https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-generative-ai

models and/or sampling techniques to guide the process and to measure overall system effectiveness."[4]

Similarly, technology is deployed within legal research software to identify other authorities of interest to the researcher based on the authorities with which the researcher has engaged. Legal research software traditionally utilizes AI for document indexing and natural language processing, enabling it to categorize and index legal documents and efficiently retrieve relevant information. Because generative AI creates content, however, lawyers have an obligation to verify that the citations are correct and that they accurately summarize the cases or other information cited.

In legal applications, generative AI is like having an assistant who can create legal documents, analyze cases, and provide insight into potential outcomes of legal issues. It works by learning from legal data and examples and then using the knowledge to generate new legal documents or predictions. Thus, instead of spending hours drafting contracts or researching case law, lawyers can now use generative AI to speed up their work and make more informed decisions.

Hallucinations & Biases

Among the reasons that AI, particularly generative AI, is so controversial is that the software sometimes responds to queries with "hallucinations," or "false answers." IBM describes hallucinations as follows:

> AI hallucination is a phenomenon wherein a large language model (LLM)—often a generative AI chatbot or computer vision tool—perceives patterns or objects that are nonexistent or imperceptible to human observers, creating outputs that are nonsensical or altogether inaccurate.

> Generally, if a user makes a request of a generative AI tool, they desire an output that appropriately addresses the prompt (*i.e.*, a correct answer to a question). However, sometimes AI algorithms produce outputs that are not based on training data, are incorrectly decoded by the transformer or do not follow any identifiable pattern. In other words, it "hallucinates" the response.

Generative AI is not a clean slate, free from prejudices and preconceptions. To the contrary, AI has biases that are the result of the data input into them. These biases can lead to discrimination, favoring certain groups or perspectives over others, and can manifest in areas like facial recognition and hiring decisions. Addressing AI biases is essential to obtaining the best results.

Lawyers have fallen victim to hallucinations and biases, signing their names to briefs authored entirely by or with the assistance of AI, which included some nonexistent cases. Some recent examples include:

---

[4] The Sedona Conference Glossary: eDiscovery & Digital Information Management, Fifth Edition, 21 SEDONA CONF. J. 263 (2020) (definition adopted from Maura R. Grossman & Gordon V. Cormack, The Grossman-Cormack Glossary of Technology Assisted Review with Foreword by John M. Facciola, U.S. Magistrate Judge, 7 FED. CTS. L. REV. 1, 32 (2013)).

- A New York lawyer filed a brief citing fake cases generated by ChatGPT, stating in an affidavit that he consulted ChatGPT for legal research when preparing a response to a motion, and that ChatGPT provided the legal sources and assured him of the reliability of the opinions. The lawyer ultimately admitted that the source of the legal opinions had "revealed itself to be unreliable."[5]
- A New York lawyer filed an appellate reply brief citing a nonexistent case, and was referred to the court's Grievance Panel.[6]
- A Colorado lawyer submitted a brief that included false citations generated by ChatGPT. "Respondent provided example searches/results to explain his confidence in the technology. Based on the prior results, he explained, 'it never dawned on me that this technology could be deceptive.'"[7]

An example of AI bias in legal applications can be found in the predictive algorithms for risk assessment in criminal justice systems. If the algorithm disproportionately flags individuals from marginalized communities as high-risk, it could lead to unjust outcomes such as harsher sentences, perpetuating systemic biases within the legal system.

These and similar incidents have caused much concern about AI, and generative AI in particular.

How Courts Are Reacting to AI

Courts have begun to create new rules or implement new policies relating to the use of AI in court submissions. Some Courts are mandating certain attorney disclosures and verifications when submitting any document to the Court that may be generated in whole or in part by some form of AI program or application.

For example, one federal judge in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has issued a standing order requiring:

> … that counsel (or a party representing himself or herself) disclose whether he or she has used generative Artificial Intelligence ("AI") in the preparation of any complaint, answer, motion, brief, or other paper filed with the Court, including in correspondence with the Court. He or she must, in a clear and plain factual statement, disclose that generative AI has been used in any way in the preparation of the filing or correspondence and certify that each and every citation to the law or the record in the filing has been verified as authentic and accurate.[8]

A federal judge in Texas has a standing order requiring a Mandatory Certification Regarding Generative Artificial Intelligence. The Order identifies that generative AI "is the product of programming devised by humans who did not have to swear [an attorney's] oath. As such, these systems hold no allegiance to any client, the rule of law, or the laws and Constitution of the United States (or, as addressed above, the truth). Unbound by any sense of duty, honor, or justice, such

---

[5] *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108263 (SDNY June 22, 2023).

[6] *Park v. Kim*, No. 22-2057, 2024 WL 332478 (2d Cir, Jan. 30, 2024).1

[7] 2023 Colo. Discipl. LEXIS 64 (Colo. O.P.D.J, Nov. 22, 2023).

[8] https://www.paed.uscourts.gov/sites/paed/files/documents/procedures/praso1_0.pdf

programs act according to computer code rather than conviction, based on programming rather than principle."[9]

Courts are also sanctioning lawyers and their firms for the misuse of AI.

For example, in *Mata*, the Southern District of New York sanctioned attorneys for writing a legal brief using ChatGPT. The Court determined that the lawyers "abandoned their responsibilities" when they submitted the AI-written brief and "then continued to stand by the fake opinions after the judicial orders called their existence into question." Both the individual attorneys and their law firm were fined $5,000 each.[10]

In *People v. Crabill*[11], an attorney was suspended for one year and one day for using cases created by ChatGPT that were not actual cases. The attorney did not cite or check any of the case references generated by ChatGPT, and he solely relied on the technology to create his brief without any review. The Colorado Supreme Court held that his conduct violated Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, 1.3, 3.3(a)(1) and 8.4(c).

The Ninth Circuit struck a brief containing false authority drawn from generative AI.[12]

---

[9] See https://www.txnd.uscourts.gov/judge/judge-brantley-starr, in which the Judge writes:

> All attorneys and pro se litigants appearing before the Court must, together with their notice of appearance, file on the docket a certificate attesting either that no portion of any filing will be drafted by generative artificial intelligence (such as ChatGPT, Harvey.AI, or Google Bard) or that any language drafted by generative artificial intelligence will be checked for accuracy, using print reporters or traditional legal databases, by a human being. These platforms are incredibly powerful and have many uses in the law: form divorces, discovery requests, suggested errors in documents, anticipated questions at oral argument. But legal briefing is not one of them. Here's why. These platforms in their current states are prone to hallucinations and bias. On hallucinations, they make stuff up—even quotes and citations. Another issue is reliability or bias. While attorneys swear an oath to set aside their personal prejudices, biases, and beliefs to faithfully uphold the law and represent their clients, generative artificial intelligence is the product of programming devised by humans who did not have to swear such an oath. As such, these systems hold no allegiance to any client, the rule of law, or the laws and Constitution of the United States (or, as addressed above, the truth). Unbound by any sense of duty, honor, or justice, such programs act according to computer code rather than conviction, based on programming rather than principle. Any party believing a platform has the requisite accuracy and reliability for legal briefing may move for leave and explain why. Accordingly, the Court will strike any filing from a party who fails to file a certificate on the docket attesting that they have read the Court's judge-specific requirements and understand that they will be held responsible under Rule 11 for the contents of any filing that they sign and submit to the Court, regardless of whether generative artificial intelligence drafted any portion of that filing.

[10] *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, Case No. 22-CV-1461, 2023 WL 4114965, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108263 (S.D.N.Y., July 7, 2023).

[11] *People v. Zachariah C. Crabill*. 23PDJ067. November 22, 2023.

[12] https://news.bloomberglaw.com/bloomberg-law-analysis/analysis-sanctions-for-fake-generative-ai-cites-harm-clients#:~:text=There%20are%20other%20ways%20to,appropriate%20bar%20or%20disciplinary%20committee.

Lawyers are, therefore, facing disciplinary actions, both before judges and disciplinary authorities, for using AI technology without taking appropriate steps to ensure its accuracy and that their clients are receiving effective representation with its use.

What Other Jurisdictions Are Saying

In every jurisdiction that has issued guidance or made recommendations concerning the use of AI, there is one common theme: Lawyers must recognize the risks and benefits of AI technology. If they choose to use AI, particularly generative AI, they must understand its strengths and weaknesses and employ it consistent with their ethical obligations under the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Florida

The Florida State Bar, Ethics Opinion 24-1 (2024), concludes that lawyers may use generative AI in the practice of law but must (1) protect the confidentiality of client information, (2) provide accurate and competent services, (3) avoid improper billing practices, and (4) comply with applicable restrictions on lawyer advertising.

The Opinion points out that lawyers must also make reasonable efforts to prevent unauthorized access to client information and understand the risks associated with the use of technology. They also remain responsible for their work product and must verify the accuracy and sufficiency of research performed by generative AI. The Opinion concludes that lawyers must continue to develop competency in the use of generative AI and stay informed about the risks and benefits of new technologies.

New York

The New York State Bar Association Task Force on Artificial Intelligence issued a Report and Recommendations (2024) in which it offered "no conclusions." Rather, the Task Force stated:

> As a profession, we must continue to refine the initial guidelines suggested in this report and audit the efficacy of proposed rules and regulations. We liken this journey to the mindset of ancient explorers: be cautious, be curious, be vigilant and be brave.

The Report does, however, affirm that lawyers must comply with the Rules of Professional Conduct. In addition, the Report provides (1) an extensive history and analysis of the evolution of AI and generative AI, (2) the benefits and risks of AI and generative AI use, (3) the impact of AI on legal profession, (4) legislative overview and recommendations, (5) AI and generative AI guidelines under the Rules of Professional Conduct.

California

The State Bar of California Standing Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct issued "Practical Guidance For The Use Of Generative Artificial Intelligence In The Practice Of Law" (2023), explaining that:

> Generative AI use presents unique challenges; it uses large volumes of data, there are many competing AI models and products, and, even for those who create generative AI products, there is a lack of clarity as to how it works. In addition, generative AI poses the risk of encouraging greater reliance and trust on its outputs because of its purpose to generate responses and its ability to do so in a manner that projects confidence and effectively emulates human responses. A lawyer should consider these and other risks before using generative AI in providing legal services.

New Jersey

The New Jersey Supreme Court Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts issued "Preliminary Guidelines On New Jersey Lawyers' Use of Artificial Intelligence" (2024). The Guidelines explain that AI does not change the fundamental duties of legal professionals to be aware of new applications and potential challenges in the discharge of such responsibilities. In particular, the report notes that "As with any disruptive technology, a lack of careful engagement with AI could lead to ethical violations, underscoring the need for lawyers to adapt their practices mindfully and ethically in this evolving landscape."

The Guidelines further explain that the use of AI does not change the lawyer's duty to (1) be accurate and truthful, (2) be honest and candid when communicating, (3) preserve confidentiality, (4) prevent misconduct, including discrimination, and (5) provide oversight to lawyers, nonlawyer staff and others.

<u>Michigan</u>

The State Bar of Michigan, in Ethics Opinion JI-155 (2023), addresses judicial competence and artificial intelligence, and concludes that judicial officers need to maintain competence with advancing technology, especially artificial intelligence, and how it affects their conduct and decisions. The Opinion provides examples of how AI can pose ethical dilemmas, such as bias, partiality, explainability, or accuracy, as well as how AI can assist judges in tasks like docket management, legal research, drafting documents, or answering questions.

The Opinion concludes that judicial officers have an ethical obligation to understand technology, including AI, and take reasonable steps to ensure that AI tools are used properly and within the confines of the law and court rules. The document also recommends that judges ask the right questions and place their analysis and application of AI on the record.

How the Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct Apply to AI Use for Lawyers

Lawyers' use of artificial intelligence implicates the same ethical issues as other forms of technology. However, there is the additional caveat that lawyers must not only comply with the Rules of Professional Conduct but also ensure that AI adheres to the same requirements.

In particular, the use of AI applies to the lawyer's duties of (1) confidentiality, (2) competence, (3) candor, (4) truthfulness, (5) supervision, (6) communication, (7) conflicts of interest, and (8) the unauthorized practice of law, and implicates the following Rules of Professional Conduct:

1.   Duty of Competence

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 1.1(Competence) states:

> A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.

In addition, Comment [8] states in relevant part:

> To maintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology, engage in continuing study and education and comply with all continuing legal education requirements to which the lawyer is subject.

Thus, if a lawyer chooses to use AI or any other technology, the lawyer has the responsibility to (1) understand the technology and how it works, (2) understand the benefits of the technology, (3) understand the risks of the technology, (4) check and verify all citations and the material cited, and (5) especially in cases where the benefits outweigh the risks, have an obligation to educate the client and seek their informed consent to use the technology. At their core, the obligations under all of the relevant Rules are subject to Rule 1.1.

2.   Communication

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 1.4 ("Communication") states:

(a)   A lawyer shall:
(1)   promptly inform the client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(e), is required by these Rules;
(2)   reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished;
(3)   keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter;
(4)   promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; and

(5)   consult with the client about any relevant limitation on the lawyer's conduct when the lawyer knows that the client expects assistance not permitted by the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.

(b)   A lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.

Rule 1.4 requires the lawyer to inform the client of the benefits, risks, and limits of the use of generative AI. In conjunction with the client, the lawyer must also determine whether the permissible use of generative AI would serve the client's objectives in the representation.

3.   Duty of Confidentiality

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6 ("Confidentiality of Information") states in relevant part:

> A lawyer shall not reveal information relating to representation of a client unless the clients give informed consent, except for disclosures that are impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation ….

4.   Conflicts

Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct Rules 1.7 ("Conflict of Interest: Current Clients") and 1.9 ("Duties to Former Clients") preclude a lawyer from revealing information relating to a representation of a current or former client or from using that information to the disadvantage of the current or former client. Because the large language models used in generative AI continue to develop, some without safeguards similar to those already in use in law offices, such as ethical walls, they may run afoul of Rules 1.7 and 1.9 by using the information developed from one representation to inform another. Therefore, a lawyer must not input any confidential information of a client into AI that lacks adequate confidentiality and security protections.

5.   Meritorious Claims and Contentions

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 3.1 ("Meritorious Claims and Contentions") states:

> A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law. A lawyer for the defendant in a criminal proceeding, or the respondent in a proceeding that could result in incarceration, may nevertheless so defend the proceeding as to require that every element of the case be established.

In addition, Comment [4] states in relevant part:

> Legal argument based on a knowingly false representation of law constitutes dishonesty toward the tribunal. A lawyer is not required to make a disinterested exposition of the law, but must recognize the existence of pertinent legal authorities… The underlying concept is

that legal argument is a discussion seeking to determine the legal premises properly applicable to the case.

The ability of AI tools to generate text opens a new frontier in our ethics guidance. Rather than focus on whether a lawyer's choice of specific legal arguments has merit, some lawyers have used Generative AI platforms without checking citations and legal arguments. In essence, the AI tool gives lawyers exactly what they were seeking, and the lawyers, having obtained positive results, fail to perform due diligence on those results. Regardless, whether a baseless argument is made with the assistance of AI or not is irrelevant; the lawyer is responsible.

6. Candor Toward the Tribunal

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 3.3 ("Candor Toward the Tribunal") states in relevant part:

> (a) A lawyer shall not knowingly:
> (1) make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer;
> (2) fail to disclose to the tribunal legal authority in the controlling jurisdiction known to the lawyer to be directly adverse to the position of the client and not disclosed by opposing counsel; or
> (3) offer evidence that the lawyer knows to be false. If a lawyer, the lawyer's client, or a witness called by the lawyer, has offered material evidence before a tribunal or in an ancillary proceeding conducted pursuant to a tribunal's adjudicative authority, such as a deposition, and the lawyer comes to know of its falsity, the lawyer shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal. A lawyer may refuse to offer evidence, other than the testimony of a defendant in a criminal matter, that the lawyer reasonably believes is false.
> (b) A lawyer who represents a client in an adjudicative proceeding and who knows that a person intends to engage, is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceeding shall take reasonable remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal.
> (c) The duties stated in paragraphs (a) and (b) continue to the conclusion of the proceeding, and apply even if compliance requires disclosure of information otherwise protected by Rule 1.6.

Further, Comment [10] to Rule 3.3 states in relevant part:

> Having offered material evidence in the belief that it was true, a lawyer may subsequently come to know that the evidence is false… In such situations… the lawyer must take reasonable remedial measures. In such situations, the advocate's proper course is to remonstrate with the client confidentially, advise the client of the lawyer's duty of candor to the tribunal and seek the client's cooperation with respect to the withdrawal or correction of the false statements or evidence. If that fails, the advocate must take further remedial

action. If withdrawal from the representation is not permitted or will not undo the effect of the false evidence, the advocate must make such disclosure to the tribunal as is reasonably necessary to remedy the situation, even if doing so requires the lawyer to reveal information that otherwise would be protected by Rule 1.6. It is for the tribunal then to determine what should be done — making a statement about the matter to the trier of fact, ordering a mistrial or perhaps nothing.

The full version of this Comment is focused on a false statement by a *client*; however, a lawyer has an obligation to ensure that evidence has not been altered or invented from whole cloth by an AI tool. Upon learning of altered or invented evidence, the lawyer must take "reasonable remedial measures."

Rule 3.3 imposes multiple obligations on lawyers. A lawyer must be both proactive and reactive in not presenting false statements or false evidence to a tribunal. This Rule goes hand in hand with Rule 1.1 (Competence); lawyers must be competent in their use of legal tools, including AI, which may reduce the risk of violating Rule 3.3.

7. Duty to Supervise

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 5.1 ("Responsibilities of Partners, Managers and Supervisory Lawyers") states:

> (a) A partner in a law firm, and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm, shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct.
>
> (b) A lawyer having direct supervisory authority over another lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyer conforms to the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 5.3 ("Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistance") states:

> With respect to a nonlawyer employed or retained by or associated with a lawyer:
>
> (a) a partner and a lawyer who individually or together with other lawyers possesses comparable managerial authority in a law firm shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that the person's conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer.
>
> (b) a lawyer having direct supervisory authority over the nonlawyer shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the person's conduct is compatible with the professional obligations of the lawyer; and,
>
> (c) a lawyer shall be responsible for conduct of such a person that would be a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if engaged in by a lawyer if:
>
> > (1) the lawyer orders or, with the knowledge of the specific conduct, ratifies the conduct involved; or

(2) the lawyer is a partner or has comparable managerial authority in the law firm in which the person is employed, or has direct supervisory authority over the person, and in either case knows of the conduct at a time when its consequences can be avoided or mitigated but fails to take reasonable remedial action.

The same ethical rules that apply to lawyers who employ or retain paralegals, junior associates, or outside consultants applies to lawyers who utilize AI. Rule 5.1 addresses the responsibilities of partners, managers, and supervisory lawyers at a law firm and requires that they "make reasonable efforts to ensure that the firm has in effect measures giving reasonable assurance that all lawyers in the firm conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct."

While Rule 5.3 applies to "non-lawyers" and "persons," where AI is able to function like a human, the Rule should apply with the same force. Thus, when contemplating the appropriate use of generative AI, lawyers should consider whether an AI tool can satisfy the Rules of Professional Conduct to the same extent as a human hired to complete the same tasks.

8. Unauthorized Practice of Law

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 5.5 ("Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law") states in relevant part:

(a) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.

In AI's development, even in machine learning, where AI learns independently, humans initially program the technology, making AI essentially a creation of humans. To the extent that the AI programmer is not a lawyer, the programmer may violate Rule 5.5 regarding the unauthorized practice of law. To avoid the UPL, lawyers must ensure that AI does not give legal advice or engage in tasks that require legal judgment or expertise, without the involvement of a licensed attorney. There must always be a human element in the legal work product to ensure that lawyers are upholding their ethical obligations.

9. Duty of Truthfulness

Pennsylvania Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4 ("Misconduct") provides in relevant part:

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:
 (c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.

Prior Committee Opinions

The Pennsylvania Bar Association Committee on Legal Ethics and Professional Responsibility in Formal Opinion 2011-200 ("Ethical Obligations For Attorneys Using Cloud Computing/Software As A Service While Fulfilling The Duties Of Confidentiality and Preservation Of Client Property") describes the steps that a lawyer should take when dealing with "cloud" computing, including

detailed lists of required steps and descriptions of what other states have held on the issue. The same rationale applies to a lawyer's use of AI.

In that opinion, the Committee emphasizes that "lawyers must be conscientious about maintaining traditional confidentiality, competence, and supervisory standards."

In PBA Formal Opinion 2022-400 ("Ethical Obligations For Lawyers Using Email And Transmitting Confidential Information"), the Committee stated:

> Given the changes in technology and the rise of cyberattacks, this Formal Opinion concludes that the Rules of Professional Conduct require more. Rule 1.1 requires a lawyer to be competent, including understanding the benefits and risks associated with technology such as email. Rule 1.4 requires a lawyer to "reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished." Rule 1.6(d) requires a lawyer to "make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client."

In PBA Formal Opinion 2022-500 ("Ethical Considerations For Lawyers Storing Information Relating To The Representation Of A Client On A Smartphone"), the Committee stated:

> … if a lawyer's smartphone contains information governed by Pa.R.P.C. 1.6, then the lawyer may not consent to share the information with a smartphone app unless the lawyer concludes that no human being will view that information, and that the information will not be sold or transferred to additional third parties, without the client's consent.

Guidance Applicable to Technology Generally

A lawyer's duty of competence requires them to possess the necessary knowledge and skills to represent their clients effectively. The Committee has previously stated and reaffirms that the obligation extends to the use of technology:

Lawyers must be proficient in using technological tools to the same extent they are in employing traditional methods. Whether it is understanding how to navigate legal research databases, use e-discovery software, use their smartphones, use email, or otherwise safeguard client information in digital formats, lawyers are required to maintain competence across all technological means relevant to their practice.

In sum, lawyers must act reasonably, and their duty of competence applies equally to technology as it does to any other aspect of legal representation.

Guidance & Best Practices for the Use of Artificial Intelligence:

When using AI, a lawyer must ensure that any client information and materials remain confidential and safeguard that information to ensure that it is protected from breaches, data loss, and other risks. Multiple Rules of Professional Conduct are implicated in a lawyer's use of AI because so many questions arise:

- Is the client's information being used when forming queries, and if so, is it kept confidential?
- Who has access to that information?
- Is the information secure or "out in the world" for all to see?

To address these concerns, for example, some firms are implementing internal policies on whether a lawyer can use AI (and programs such as ChatGPT) when creating pleadings or other documents that may contain sensitive client information. Additionally, some legal malpractice insurance carriers will not insure for AI's use, and many policies now limit firms that are covered by them from using AI to prepare any documents, especially those that are being filed with a Court.

Therefore, the Committees conclude as follows:

- **Being Truthful & Accurate:** Lawyers must ensure that AI-generated content, such as legal documents or advice, is truthful, accurate, and based on sound legal reasoning, upholding principles of honesty and integrity in their professional conduct.

- **Verifying All Citations & The Accuracy of Cited Materials:** Lawyers must ensure the accuracy and relevance of the citations they use in legal documents or arguments. When citing legal authorities such as case law, statutes, regulations, or scholarly articles, lawyers should verify that the citations accurately reflect the content they are referencing.

- **Assuring Competence:** Lawyers must be competent in using AI technologies.

- **Maintaining Confidentiality:** Lawyers must safeguard information relating to the representation of a client and ensure that AI systems handling confidential data (1) adhere to strict confidentiality measures, and (2) confidential data will not be shared with other clients or others not protected by the attorney-client privilege.

- **Identifying Conflicts of Interest:** Lawyers must be vigilant in identifying and addressing potential conflicts of interest arising from using AI systems.

- **Communicating with Clients:** Lawyers must communicate with clients about using AI technologies in their practices, providing clear and transparent explanations of how such tools are employed and their potential impact on case outcomes. If necessary, they should obtain client consent before using certain AI tools.

- **Assuring Information is Unbiased & Accurate:** Lawyers must ensure that the data used to train AI models is accurate, unbiased, and ethically sourced to prevent perpetuating biases or inaccuracies in AI-generated content.

- **Ensuring That AI Is Properly Used:** Lawyers must be vigilant against the misuse of AI-generated content, ensuring it is not used to deceive or manipulate legal processes, evidence, or outcomes.

- **Adhering to Ethical Standards:** Lawyers must stay informed about relevant regulations and guidelines governing the use of AI in legal practice to ensure compliance with legal and ethical standards.

- **Exercising Professional Judgment:** Lawyers must exercise their professional judgment in conjunction with AI-generated content, and recognize that AI is a tool that assists but does not replace legal expertise and analysis.

- **Utilizing Proper Billing Practices:** AI has tremendous time-saving capabilities. Lawyers must, therefore, ensure that AI-related expenses are reasonable and appropriately disclosed to clients.

- **Maintaining Transparency:** Lawyers should be transparent with clients, colleagues, and the courts about the use of AI tools in legal practice, including disclosing any limitations or uncertainties associated with AI-generated content.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence and generative AI tools, like any tool in a lawyer's arsenal, must be used with knowledge of their potential and an awareness of the risks and benefits the technology offers. They are to be used cautiously and in conjunction with a lawyer's careful review of the "work product" that those types of tools create. These tools do not replace personal reviews of cases, statutes, and other legislative materials. Additionally, although AI may offer increased productivity, it must be accomplished by utilizing tools to protect and safeguard confidential client information.

The Committees believe that, with appropriate safeguards, lawyers can utilize artificial intelligence in accordance with the Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct.

CAVEAT: The foregoing opinion is advisory only and is not binding on the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania or any other Court. This opinion carries only such weight as an appropriate reviewing authority may choose to give it.