



New 2018 Customs Directive Provides Greater Protection for Attorney-Client Privileged Materials During U.S. Border Crossings

By Andrew S. Boutros and John R. Schleppenbach

This is Part II to our earlier One Minute Memo from November 2017, entitled "Recent Ethics Opinion Provides Key Guidance for All Attorneys Crossing the Border with Client Information."

The recent increase in the number of border searches of electronic devices by United States Customs & Border Protection (CBP) has raised ethical concerns for all attorneys, including in-house counsel. Rule 1.6(c) of the widely-adopted ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct provides that "[a] lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to prevent the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client."

In November 2017, we reported on a first-of-its kind Formal Ethics Opinion from the Association of the Bar of the City of New York Committee on Professional Ethics that construed New York's version of Rule 1.6(c). That decision concluded that attorneys have an obligation—before they cross any borders—to assess the risk that client information will be breached, the potential harms that could result, and any safeguards that could be implemented.

In a positive development, CBP recently issued a new 2018 Directive on inbound and outbound U.S. border searches that provides greater protection for client confidences. The Directive has application to all lawyers who practice in the United States who maintain attorney-client privileged communications. Most notably, the Directive makes clear that:

- absent reasonable suspicion of unlawful activity or a national security concern, an officer performing a border search
 may <u>not</u> connect external equipment to an electronic device to review, copy, and/or analyze its contents;
- border searches may **not** include using portable electronic devices to access remotely-stored information; and
- border officers are **required** to consult CBP counsel before searching any device as to which a claim of privilege is raised and to seek clarification from the individual asserting this privilege as to specific files, folders, attorney or client names, or other particulars that may assist CBP in identifying privileged information so it can be segregated during a border search.

For the full version of this most recent article, which originally appeared in *Bloomberg Law White Collar Report*, 13 WCR 221 (March 16, 2018), and contains the authors' detailed practical tips for complying with attorney ethical obligations during border crossings, <u>click here</u>.

Seyfarth Shaw has deep, substantial experience handling cross-border internal investigations and government enforcement actions, as well as other global matters. Andrew S. Boutros is National Co-Chair of Seyfarth Shaw's White Collar, Internal Investigations, and False Claims Team. He is a partner in the firm's Chicago and Washington, D.C. offices and can be reached at aboutros@seyfarth.com. John R. Schleppenbach is a member the firm's White Collar, Internal Investigations, and False Claims Team and is counsel in the firm's Chicago office. He can be reached at ischleppenbach@seyfarth.com.

www.seyfarth.com

Attorney Advertising. This One Minute Memo is a periodical publication of Seyfarth Shaw LLP and should not be construed as legal advice or a legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information purposes only, and you are urged to consult a lawyer concerning your own situation and any specific legal questions you may have. Any tax information or written tax advice contained herein (including any attachments) is not intended to be and cannot be used by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer. (The foregoing legend has been affixed pursuant to U.S. Treasury Regulations governing tax practice.)

Seyfarth Shaw LLP One Minute Memo® | March 19, 2018

©2018 Seyfarth Shaw LLP. All rights reserved. "Seyfarth Shaw" refers to Seyfarth Shaw LLP (an Illinois limited liability partnership). Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.