



STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

APPEALS AND OPINIONS BUREAU

Telephone (518) 776-2009

December 15, 2016

Elena Sassower
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.
P.O. Box 8101
White Plains, NY 10602

VIA EMAIL: elena@judgewatch.org

Re: Appeal re: Freedom of Information Law Request # 160706

Dear Ms. Sassower:

I write in response to your December 1, 2016 administrative appeal letter in the above-referenced Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) matter.

By correspondence dated September 28, 2016, you requested records relating to the following:

1. The professional background, qualifications, and employment history of Assistant Attorney General (AAG) Adrienne Kerwin;
2. AAG Kerwin's annual salary during the years of her employment at the Office of the Attorney General (OAG);
3. The names of the attorneys in the OAG responsible for supervising AAG Kerwin's work, presently and since March 28, 2014;
4. The meaning of and basis for the "of counsel" designation of AAG Kerwin in the taxpayer action's Center for Judicial Accountability v. Cuomo, et. al. (Albany Co. #5122-16) and Center for Judicial Accountability v. Cuomo, et al., (Albany Co. #1788-14);
5. The OAG's guidelines, policies, and procedures pertaining to designation, payment, and oversight of its "of counsel" attorneys;

EX X-4

6. The OAG's guidelines, policies, and procedures for evaluating conflicts of interest of its attorneys and for retaining outside counsel; and
7. The OAG's guidelines, policies, and procedures for determining the "interest of the state," pursuant to Executive Law § 63(1), and its duty to represent plaintiffs or intervene in their behalf in citizen-taxpayer actions, pursuant to State Finance Law Article 7-A.

The Records Access Officer responded to you by letter dated November 3, 2016. He sent three pages of responsive records and stated that some responsive records were being withheld (1) as attorney-client confidential communications or attorney work product, they were specifically exempted from disclosure by Public Officers Law § 87(2)(a) and CPLR 3101(c) or CPLR 4503(a); (2) because disclosure of the records would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy under Public Officers Law § 87(2)(b); or (3) the records are inter- or intra-agency materials and can be withheld under Public Officers Law § 87(2)(g).

You administratively appeal the denial.

You do not administratively appeal the Records Access Officer's determination with respect to the first and second items of your request. You do administratively appeal the Records Access Officer's determination as to the third item of your request, "records pertaining to . . . the names of the attorneys in the [OAG] responsible for supervising [AAG] Kerwin's work, presently and since March 28, 2014." That item could reasonably be interpreted to include any record that includes the name of an attorney who has supervised AAG Kerwin since March 28, 2014—for example, an email written by or copied to such an attorney or a court document submitted by that attorney. Such a request does not reasonably describe the records you seek. Assuming that what you actually seek are the names themselves, this request asks for information rather than records, as the Records Access Officer correctly determined, and which the OAG need not provide. However, I am including the information I believe you seek: since March 28, 2014, AAG Kerwin's supervisory chain has been James B. McGowan, AAG, Section Head (no longer with the OAG); Stephen M. Kerwin, AAG, Deputy Bureau Chief; Jeffrey M. Dvorin, AAG, Bureau Chief; Megan Levine, Deputy Attorney General for State Counsel; and Kent Stauffer, Executive Deputy Attorney General for State Counsel.

With respect to the fourth and fifth items of your request—"records pertaining to . . . the meaning of, and basis for, the 'of counsel' designation" of AAG Kerwin in two specific taxpayer actions and "records pertaining to . . . the [OAG's] guidelines, policies, and procedures pertaining to the designation, payment, and oversight of its 'of counsel' attorneys"—your request does not reasonably describe

Ms. Sassower
Appeal of FOIL # 160706
Page 3

the records you seek. The OAG has no identifiable record or set of records that explains the meaning of and the basis for the "of counsel" designation or that establishes the procedure for designating, paying, and overseeing "of counsel" attorneys. In an effort to clarify what I believe you may misunderstand, I note that the phrase "of counsel" does not refer to outside counsel but rather indicates the Assistant Attorney General—an employee of the OAG—who is the OAG's representative in a particular case.

The sixth item of your request was for records pertaining to the OAG's guidelines, policies, and procedures for evaluating attorney conflicts of interest and retaining outside counsel. With respect to records pertaining to guidelines, policies, and procedures for retaining outside counsel, the OAG has no responsive records. Again in an effort to clarify an apparent misunderstanding, the OAG itself does not retain outside counsel; that would be done by the state entity or employee that needs the outside counsel. With respect to the records pertaining to guidelines, policies, and procedures for evaluating attorney conflicts of interest, I am enclosing a copy of the OAG's Conflict of Interest Screening Procedures.

With respect to the seventh item of your request, please be advised that, after a diligent search, the OAG located no responsive records.

This is a final agency determination. Please be advised that judicial review of this determination can be obtained under Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law & Rules.

Very truly yours,



KATHRYN SHEINGOLD
Records Appeals Officer

Cc: Committee on Open Government
OAG Records Access Officer



STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Conflict of Interest Screening Procedures

A. General Policy

All Department of Law attorneys are required by the State's Rules of Professional Conduct to maintain the confidences of their former clients, and not to engage in misconduct. *See, e.g.*, Rules of Professional Conduct (22 N.Y.C.R.R. pt. 1200) Rules 1.6, 1.9, 1.10. Paralegals, investigators, accountants, auditors and other staff members who have obtained confidential information during periods of prior employment also should keep this information confidential. In addition, all Department of Law employees are governed by the restrictions set forth in the Public Officers Law, case law and the rules and opinions of the Commission on Public Integrity (and the Commission's predecessors).

As a result, all Department of Law attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors are prohibited from working on any legal matter¹ involving a former employer or client, or having any discussions with any other staff member about any such legal matter, if: (1) the employee previously obtained confidential information or documents relating to the former employer or client; (2) the confidences received by the employee are material to the pending legal matter; and (3) the interests of the former employer or client are adverse to the interests of the State.

In addition, all attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors entering state service from the private sector must consider recusal from any legal matter concerning a former employer or client with which there was a business relationship during the prior two years, *even if the employee has no confidential information*. Factors to be considered in making such a determination include but are not limited to: (1) the nature of the prior relationship; (2) the nature and

¹ For the purposes of these procedures, references to legal matters involving the State of New York shall include all legal matters where the Department of Law is investigating, regulating or litigating on its own behalf, or is providing representation to the State or any of its agencies, authorities and other state entities, or to any state officers or employees in their official capacity.

Conflict of Interest Screening Procedures

Page 2

importance of the employee's role in the matter, including the discretion to be exercised; and (3) the sensitivity of the matter. See N.Y. State Ethics Comm'n, Advisory Op. 98-9 (1998).

All attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors have a continuing obligation to comply with these prohibitions, and must advise their supervisors if they know or become aware that a former client or employer is involved in a legal matter against the State, and that they therefore may have to be screened from the case.

B. Obligation to Report Potential Conflicts

1. Current Employees

All attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors must advise the Department of Law if they have ever worked for, or obtained confidential information relating to, any individual or entity that they know is currently involved in a legal matter with the State of New York, where the interests of the former employer or client are adverse to the interests of the State of New York.

In addition, attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors who have worked in the private sector within the past two years must advise the Department of Law if they know that any employer or client with which the employee had a business relationship during such two-year period is involved in any adverse legal matter with the State of New York.

2. Prospective Employees

All individuals applying to the Department of Law for a position as an attorney, paralegal, investigator, accountant or auditor will be required to state whether they have ever worked for, or obtained confidential information relating to, any individual or entity that the prospective employee knows is currently involved in any legal matter with the State of New York, where the interests of the former employer or client are adverse to the interests of the State of New York.

If the prospective employee is *currently* working on any such legal matter and has confidential information that is material to the legal matter, then the prospective employee will be told that, before an offer of employment can be made, the prospective employee may have to inform the client that an application for employment has been submitted to the Department of Law. Such decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. In addition, the prospective employee will be prohibited from discussing the legal matter during the interview process.

Moreover, if the prospective employee wishes to work *on behalf of the State* on any legal matter where the prospective employee has confidential information relating to an adverse party, then the prospective employee will be informed that any offer of employment may be contingent upon obtaining: (1) written approval from the adverse party authorizing the prospective employee to work on the legal matter and waiving any right to seek the disqualification of the attorney or the Department of Law; and (2) written approval from the Commission on Public Integrity for the prospective employee to work on such legal matter.

C. Circumstances In Which Screening Procedures Will Be Implemented

1. Employees Who Previously Worked on Legal Matters Involving New York State

Any attorney, paralegal, investigator, accountant or auditor who, during any prior employment, worked on a legal matter in which the State of New York was an adverse party, and obtained confidential client information or documents material to such legal matter, shall be screened from the matter and from any substantially related legal matter. No screening shall be required if the former client grants approval for the employee to work on the legal matter.

2. Employees With Confidential Information

Any attorney, paralegal, investigator, accountant or auditor who, during any prior employment, obtained confidential information or documents of an employer or client, even where the former employer or client was not involved in any legal matter with the State of New York at the time, shall be screened from any legal matter involving the former employer or client where: (a) the employee obtained confidential information material to the legal matter; and (b) the interests of the former employer or client are adverse to the interests of the State of New York. No screening shall be required if the former client grants approval for the employee to work on the legal matter.

3. Employees Who Worked in the Private Sector During the Past Two Years

Any Department of Law attorney, paralegal, investigator, accountant or auditor who had a business relationship with a private employer or client during the past two years shall consult with his or her supervisor, who shall determine whether the employee should be screened from any particular matter concerning the former employer or client. Factors to be considered include but are not limited to: (1) the nature of the prior relationship; (2) the nature and importance of the employee's role in the matter, including the discretion to be exercised; and (3) the sensitivity of

Conflict of Interest Screening Procedures

Page 4

the matter. No screening shall be required if both the client and the Commission on Public Integrity grant approval for the employee to work on the legal matter.

D. Screening Procedures

Whenever an employee must be screened from a legal matter as required by Section C of these guidelines, the following screening procedures shall be established:

a. The screened employee shall be prohibited from participating in any and all discussions, deliberations, decisions or actions of the Department of Law relating to the legal matter;

b. The screened employee shall be prohibited from communicating with any other Department of Law employee regarding the legal matter, including but not limited to attorneys and other staff members working on the legal matter;

c. The screened employee shall be prohibited from providing any Department of Law employee with any confidential information relating to the adverse party;

d. The screened employee shall be prohibited from reviewing any documents relating to the legal matter, and no such documents may be maintained or stored in the office of the screened employee;

e. All Department of Law employees working on the legal matter shall be prohibited from discussing the matter with the screened employee or in the screened employee's presence;

f. All Department of Law employees who work on the legal matter will be informed of these procedures; and

g. All Department of Law employees who work on the legal matter shall seek to ensure that these procedures are also followed by all employees under their supervision, including secretaries and paralegals, as well as all attorneys and other employees assigned to the matter in the future.

E. Conclusion

As noted above, the Public Officers Law, the Rules of Professional Conduct, the rules of the Commission on Public Integrity, and the relevant case law and opinions place significant restrictions on the activities of Department of Law attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors in legal matters where the interests of the State are adverse to the interests of former employers and clients.

Conflict of Interest Screening Procedures
Page 5

The procedures set forth above are intended to ensure that all such employees comply with these ethical and legal requirements.

Please remember that the failure to follow these procedures could result not only in the filing of ethical charges, but also in the disqualification of the entire Department of Law from a case. As a result, it is particularly important that all attorneys, paralegals, investigators, accountants, and auditors become fully familiar with these screening procedures, and make sure that they are complied with at all times.