

Utah Supreme Court Standing Order No. 15 (Amended)

(Amended June 3, 2021)

This Standing Order establishes a pilot legal regulatory sandbox and an Office of Legal Services Innovation to assist the Utah Supreme Court with overseeing and regulating the practice of law by nontraditional legal service providers or by traditional providers offering nontraditional legal services. Unless otherwise provided, this Order shall expire on the second anniversary of its effective date.

The Standing Order is effective as of August 14, 2020 (Amended June 3, 2021).

Background

The access-to-justice crisis across the globe, the United States, and Utah has reached the breaking point.¹ As to how affordable and accessible civil justice is to people, the 2020 World Justice Project Rules of Law Index ranks the United States 109th of 128 countries.² As to that same factor, out of the thirty-seven high-income countries, the United States ranks dead last.³

To put it into perspective, a recent study by the Legal Services Corporation found that 86 percent “of the civil legal problems reported by low-income Americans in [2016–17] received

¹ Access to justice means the ability of citizens to meaningfully access solutions to their justice problems, which includes access to legal information, advice, and resources, as well as access to the courts. See Rebecca L. Sandefur, *Access to What?*, DAEDALUS, Winter 2019, 49.

² WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT, WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT RULE OF LAW INDEX 2020 14, https://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/documents/WJP-ROLI-2020-Online_0.pdf.

³ *Id.*

(continued . . .)

inadequate or no legal help.”⁴ Similarly, a recently published study out of California “[m]odeled on the Legal Services” study, concluded that 60 percent of that state’s low-income citizens and 55 percent of its citizens “*regardless of income* experience at least one civil legal problem in their household each year.” The study also found that 85 percent of these legal problems “received no or inadequate legal help.”⁵ Closer to home, an in-depth April 2020 analysis of the legal needs of Utahns living at 200 percent or less of the federal poverty guidelines found that their unmet legal needs stood at 82 percent.⁶

For years, the Utah Supreme Court has made combating the access-to-justice crisis confronting Utahns of all socioeconomic levels a top priority. To date, the Supreme Court, along with the Judicial Council and the Utah Bar Association, have worked ceaselessly to improve access to justice through many initiatives: the Utah Courts Self-Help Center, the Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Program, form reform, and the Online Dispute Resolution Program, to name but a few. What has become clear during this time is that real change in Utahns’ access to legal services requires recognition that we will never volunteer ourselves across the access-to-justice divide and that what is needed is market-based, far-reaching reform focused on opening up the legal market to new providers, business models, and service options.

In its boldest step toward bridging the access-to-justice gap, the Supreme Court has undertaken an effort to reevaluate and amend several of the regulations it has historically relied upon in governing the practice of law. This Standing Order and accompanying rule changes implement that effort. The Supreme

⁴ LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION, THE JUSTICE GAP: MEASURING THE UNMET CIVIL LEGAL NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS (2017).

⁵ STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA TASK FORCE ON ACCESS THROUGH INNOVATION OF LEGAL SERVICES, FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION 11–12 (2020) (emphasis added).

⁶ UTAH FOUNDATION, THE JUSTICE GAP: ADDRESSING THE UNMET LEGAL NEEDS OF LOWER-INCOME UTAHNS 23 (2020).

(continued . . .)

Court believes that the regulatory reform set out in this Standing Order will shrink the access-to-justice gap by fostering innovation and harnessing market forces, all while protecting consumers of legal services from harm.⁷

1. General Provisions

In accordance with its plenary and exclusive authority and responsibility under article VIII, section 4 of the Utah Constitution to govern the practice of law, the Utah Supreme Court establishes the *Office of Legal Services Innovation* (Innovation Office). The Innovation Office will operate under the direct auspices of the Supreme Court and its purpose will be to assist the Supreme Court in overseeing and regulating nontraditional legal services providers and the delivery of nontraditional legal services.⁸ To this end, and subject to Supreme Court oversight, the Innovation Office will establish and administer a pilot legal regulatory sandbox (Sandbox)⁹ through which individuals and entities may be approved to offer nontraditional legal services to the public through nontraditional providers or traditional providers using novel approaches and means, including options not permitted by the Rules of Professional Conduct and other applicable rules. The

⁷ The Supreme Court’s decision to pursue changes regarding its governance of the practice of law is in keeping with (1) the Resolution of the Conference of Chief Justices and (2) the Resolution of the American Bar Association’s House of Delegates “to consider regulatory innovations that have the potential to improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of civil legal services, while also ensuring necessary and appropriate protections that best serve clients and the public”

⁸ In Utah, the practice of law is defined by Utah Supreme Court Rule of Professional Practice 14-802. This Standing Order incorporates that definition. For an understanding of “nontraditional legal services providers” and “nontraditional legal services,” please refer to Section 3.3 (Regulatory Scope).

⁹ A regulatory sandbox is a policy tool through which a government or regulatory body permits limited relaxation of applicable rules to facilitate the development and testing of innovative business models, products, or services by sandbox participants.

(continued . . .)

Supreme Court establishes the Innovation Office and the Sandbox for a pilot phase of seven years from the original effective date of this Standing Order (August 14, 2020). At the end of that period, the Supreme Court will carefully evaluate the program as a whole, including the Sandbox, to determine if it should continue. Indeed, unless expressly authorized by the Supreme Court, the program will expire at the conclusion of the seven-year study period.

2. Innovation Office

In carrying out the responsibilities designated to it by the Utah Supreme Court, the Innovation Office, at all times, will be subject to the Supreme Court's direction and control. Furthermore, the Innovation Office will have no authority to regulate any individuals, entities, or activities that are beyond the Supreme Court's constitutional scope and mandate to govern the practice of law.¹⁰ With these overarching restrictions firmly in mind, the Innovation Office will have responsibility with respect to the regulation of non-traditional legal services provided by traditional legal providers and non-traditional and traditional legal services provided by non-traditional legal providers, including those services offered within the Sandbox and those that have been approved for the general legal market ("exit or exited the Sandbox"). The Innovation Office will be responsible for (1) evaluating potential entrants to the Sandbox and recommending to the Supreme Court which entrants should to be admitted; (2) developing, overseeing, and regulating the Sandbox, including establishing protocols and monitoring nontraditional

¹⁰ By way of illustration, the Supreme Court has authorized real estate agents to advise their customers with respect to, and to complete, state-approved forms directly related to the sale of real estate. *See* Rule of the Utah Supreme Court Rules of Professional Practice 14-802(c)(12)(A). Outside of this grant, and the ability to modify it, the Supreme Court has no authority with respect to regulating real estate agents. That authority rests with the legislative and executive branches. By way of further illustration, some attorneys hold both J.D.s and M.D.s. The Supreme Court only governs the ability of these individuals to practice law. It has never interfered with their ability to practice medicine.

(continued . . .)

legal providers and services therein, as well as terminating an entrant's participation in the Sandbox where deemed appropriate and in keeping with the regulatory principles set forth below; and (3) recommending to the Supreme Court which entrants be permitted to exit the Sandbox and enter the general legal market.¹¹

The Innovation Office will be funded initially by a grant from the State Justice Institute and in-kind contributions from the National Center for State Courts and the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System. The Innovation Office will have the authority to seek additional grant funding and may also be supported through licensing fees as noted in Section 4.9.

The Innovation Office will meet regularly and at least monthly, on a day and at a time and place of its convenience. It will also report monthly to the Supreme Court during one of the Court's regularly scheduled meetings.

2.1 Office Composition

The Utah Supreme Court will appoint the members of the Innovation Office.¹² The Innovation Office will consist of a Chair, Vice-Chair, and nine additional members, all serving on a volunteer basis. Five of the members shall serve as the Executive Committee of the Innovation Office. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the Chair and Vice-Chair and three additional members appointed by the Court. The Executive Committee will be responsible for setting the Agenda for each meeting of the Innovation Office and for making initial recommendations to the Innovation Office regarding applicants.

In the event of a vacancy, or on its own motion, the Supreme Court will appoint, depending on the vacancy, a new Chair, Vice-Chair, or member. The Court will strive to appoint nonlawyers (pubic

¹¹ Innovation Office resources may limit the number of Sandbox entrants.

¹² The Supreme Court Task Force on Regulatory Reform shall continue to operate pending the appointment of the members of the Innovation Office. Upon appointment of the members of the Innovation Office, Utah Supreme Court Standing Order 14 shall be vacated in accordance with the terms of that Standing Order.

members) as at least five of the members and will prioritize a membership body diverse across gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, and professional expertise.

Innovation Office actions will be taken by majority vote by a quorum of the members.

2.2 Conflicts of Interests

The Utah Supreme Court acknowledges that instances may arise in which Innovation Office members may face conflicts of interest between their business or personal affairs and their member duties. A conflict of interest arises when members – or a member of their immediate family – have a financial interest in a Sandbox applicant or participant or in an entity that has successfully exited the Sandbox. For example, a member’s firm may apply to offer services as part of the Sandbox. Recognizing that transparency and public confidence are paramount concerns, the Supreme Court requires that in cases of conflict, the implicated member(s) disclose the conflict to the Innovation Office in writing and recuse from any involvement regarding that particular Sandbox applicant or participant. The Innovation Office will maintain a record of all conflicts and recusals and make all records related to conflicts and recusals publicly available.

2.3 Office Authority

Subject to the limitations set forth in the Standing Order and the ultimate authority and control of the Utah Supreme Court, the Innovation Office will have the authority to oversee the nontraditional provision of legal services (*see* Section 3.3.2 on Regulatory Scope) using an objectives-based and risk-based approach to regulation.

Objectives-based regulation specifically and clearly articulates regulatory objectives to guide development and implementation. Both the Innovation Office and the Sandbox participants will be guided in their actions by specific objectives.

Risk-based regulation uses data-driven assessments of market activities to target regulatory resources to those entities and

activities presenting the highest risk to the regulatory objectives and consumer well-being. Using risk-based regulation enables the Innovation Office to better prioritize its resources and manage risks in the Utah legal services market.

The Supreme Court grants the Innovation Office the authority to develop and propose processes and procedures around licensing, monitoring, and enforcement to carry out its mission in light of the Regulatory Objective and Regulatory Principles outlined in Section 3.¹³

The Innovation Office must submit proposed processes, procedures, and fee schedules to the Supreme Court for approval as they are developed and before they take effect.

3. Regulatory Objective, Principles, and Scope

3.1 Regulatory Objective

The overarching goal of this reform is to improve access to justice. With this goal firmly in mind, the Innovation Office will be guided by a single regulatory objective: To ensure consumers have access to a well-developed, high-quality, innovative, affordable, and competitive market for legal services. The Utah Supreme Court's view is that adherence to this objective will improve access to justice by improving the ability of Utahns to meaningfully access solutions to their justice problems, including access to legal information, advice, and other resources, as well as access to the courts.

¹³ The Implementation Task Force on Regulatory Reform has already established an Innovation Office Manual. A copy of that manual may be viewed at sandbox.utcourt.gov.

(continued . . .)

3.2 Regulatory Principles

The Innovation Office will be guided by the following regulatory principles:

1. Regulation should be based on the evaluation of risk to the consumer.¹⁴
2. Risk to the consumer should be evaluated relative to the current legal services options available.¹⁵
3. Regulation should establish probabilistic thresholds for acceptable levels of harm.¹⁶
4. Regulation should be empirically driven.¹⁷
5. Regulation should be guided by a market-based approach.¹⁸

¹⁴ The phrase “based on the evaluation of risk” means that regulatory intervention should be proportional and responsive to the actual risk of harm posed to the consumer, as supported by the evidence.

¹⁵ The phrase “relative to the current legal service options available” means that risk should not be evaluated as against an ideal of perfect legal representation by a lawyer. Risk should rather be measured as against the reality of current market options for consumers. In many cases, that means no access to legal representation or legal resources at all.

¹⁶ The phrase “probabilistic thresholds for acceptable levels of harm” (the chance a consumer is harmed) means the probability of a risk occurring and the magnitude of the harm should the risk occur. Based on this assessment, the Innovation Office will determine thresholds of acceptable risks for identified harms. Regulatory resources should be focused on areas in which, on balance, there is a high probability of harm or a significant impact from that harm on the consumer or the market.

¹⁷ The phrase “empirically driven” means that the regulatory approach and actions must be supported, whenever possible, by data from the legal services market.

¹⁸ The phrase “market-based approach” means that regulatory tactics should seek to align regulatory incentives with increased revenue or decreased costs for market participants in order to encourage desired behavior or outcomes.

(continued . . .)

3.3 Regulatory Scope

As noted, under the auspices of the Utah Supreme Court, the Innovation Office will be responsible for developing, overseeing, and regulating the Sandbox, including the oversight of nontraditional legal providers and services therein. The Supreme Court offers the following examples to help individuals and entities, lawyers and nonlawyers alike, understand the Innovation Office's regulatory scope. These examples are just that and the list is not intended to be exhaustive.

3.3.1 Outside the Regulatory Scope

Individuals and entities that carry out the following activities are outside the Innovation Office's regulatory scope, remain under the Utah Bar's authority, and need not notify the Innovation Office:

Partnerships, corporations, and companies entirely owned and controlled by lawyers in good standing; individual lawyers with an active Utah Bar license; and legal services nonprofits:

- (i) offering traditional legal services as permitted under the Rules of Professional Conduct; or
- (ii) using new advertising, solicitation, fee-sharing, or fee-splitting approaches as contemplated by the Rules of Professional Conduct.¹⁹

¹⁹ Partnerships, corporations, and companies entirely owned and controlled by lawyers; individual lawyers with an active Utah Bar license; and legal services nonprofits may not, however, engage in fee-splitting or fee-sharing in an effort to avoid the prohibition against outside ownership set forth in rule 5.4A of the Utah Rules of Professional Conduct.

(continued . . .)

3.3.2 Within the Innovation Office's Regulatory Scope

Individuals and entities that carry out the following activities are within the scope of the Innovation Office's regulatory authority and are subject to this Standing Order's requirements:²⁰

- (a) Partnerships, corporations, and companies entirely owned and controlled by lawyers; individual lawyers with an active Utah Bar license; and legal services nonprofits partnering with a nonlawyer-owned entity to offer legal services as contemplated by Rule 5.4B;
- (b) Nonlawyer owned entities, or legal entities in which nonlawyers are partial owners (for profit or nonprofit):
 - (i) offering legal practice options whether directly or by partnership, joint venture, subsidiary, franchise, or other corporate structure or business arrangement, not authorized under the Rules of Professional Conduct in effect prior to [Month] [Date], 2020, or under Utah Supreme Court Rule of Professional Practice 14-802; or
 - (ii) practicing law through technology platforms, or lawyer or nonlawyer staff, or through an acquired law firm.

3.3.3 Disbarred Lawyers and Individuals with Criminal History

Disbarred Lawyers. The Utah Supreme Court has determined that lawyers who have been disbarred²¹ present a significant risk of harm to consumers if in the position of ownership or control of an entity or individual providing legal services. Therefore, disbarred

²⁰ This list is not meant to be exclusive or exhaustive. There may be business arrangements, models, products, or services not contemplated in Section 3.3.2, which are welcome and should come through the Sandbox. The Sandbox is not, however, meant to enable lawyers not licensed in Utah to practice in Utah without authorization from the Utah State Bar.

²¹ For purposes of this Standing Order, a lawyer whose license has been suspended qualifies as a disbarred lawyer during the period of suspension.

lawyers are not permitted to gain or hold an ownership interest of greater than 10 percent in any entity authorized to practice law under Rule 5.4B or this Standing Order.

In addition, any entity applying for authorization to offer services in the Sandbox must disclose the following:

- (a) whether the entity has any material corporate relationship and/or business partnership with a disbarred lawyer, and
- (b) whether a disbarred lawyer works with or within the entity, in either an employment or contractual relationship, and is in a managerial role in the direct provision of legal services to consumers.

Criminal History. The Supreme Court has determined that individuals with certain serious criminal histories may present an increased risk of harm to consumers if in the position of ownership or control of a legal service entity.

Any entity applying for authorization to offer services in the Sandbox must disclose the following:

- (a) whether any individual holding an ownership interest of greater than 10 percent in the entity has a felony criminal history,
- (b) whether the entity has any material corporate relationship or business partnership with an individual with a felony criminal history, and
- (c) whether an individual with a felony criminal history works with or within the entity, in either an employment or contractual relationship, and is in a managerial role in the direct provision of legal services to consumers.

The Innovation Office, on receipt of any disclosures required above, will incorporate the information into the risk assessment of the entity as appropriate. To the extent permitted by law, the Innovation Office may also conduct independent criminal history checks.

Falsifying any information, including lawyer status and individual criminal history, is a basis for dismissal from the Sandbox and in

the event the entity or individual has exited the Sandbox, a basis for loss of licensure. Other criminal and civil sanctions may also apply.

4. The Sandbox

The Sandbox is a policy tool by which the Utah Supreme Court, through the Innovation Office, can permit innovative legal services to be offered to the public in a controlled environment. The Innovation Office will develop, oversee, and regulate the Sandbox according to the guidance outlined in this Standing Order. Individuals and entities wanting to offer the public nontraditional legal business models, services, or products must notify the Innovation Office. Individuals and entities in the Sandbox will be subject to such data reporting requirements and ongoing supervision as the Innovation Office determines, so long as the requirements fall within its regulatory authority.

4.1 Application

All individuals and entities that fall within the Regulatory Scope (Section 3.3.2) must apply to the Innovation Office for authorization to enter the Sandbox.

4.2 Application Process

The objective of the application process is for the Innovation Office to determine that the legal service proposed by the applicant furthers the Regulatory Objective and does not present unacceptable levels of risk of consumer harm. The Innovation Office will develop an efficient and responsive process for intake, review, assessment, and response to applications.

The Utah Supreme Court contemplates that the application process will be iterative and will include communications between the Innovation Office and the various applicants, as necessary.

The Innovation Office will make a determination as to whether an applicant's proposed legal service furthers the Regulatory Objective and does not present an unacceptable risk of consumer harm. The Innovation Office will make recommendations to the Supreme Court regarding whether an applicant should be authorized and the associated requirements for the applicant (e.g., reporting, disclosure, risk mitigation, insurance requirements). In

developing these requirements, the Innovation Office will consider the Regulatory Objective and Regulatory Principles.

If the Innovation Office does not find that an applicant's proposed legal service furthers the Regulatory Objective or finds that it presents an unacceptable risk of consumer harm, the Innovation Office will deny the proposed authorization, and will include a brief written explanation supporting the finding. The Innovation Office will develop a process for appeal of a denial of a proposed authorization to the Supreme Court.

4.3 Authorization

As with the licensing of lawyers and Licensed Paralegal Practitioners, the Utah Supreme Court will ultimately be responsible for approving or denying authorization to nontraditional legal service providers.

An approved application means permission to offer the proposed legal service in the Sandbox as outlined in the approval and under the Innovation Office's authority. Authorized participants and services are deemed authorized to practice law in Utah, albeit on a limited and temporary basis, under Utah Supreme Court Rule of Professional Practice 14-802.

Denial of authorization by the Supreme Court has the effect of returning the application to the Innovation Office. The Supreme Court may include a brief written explanation of the reasons for its decision not to authorize the applicant. This information may guide the applicant in how to potentially resolve concerns and revise its application for reconsideration for authorization. However, to be clear, some (perhaps many) applicants may not be approved to enter or exit the Sandbox.

Additionally, and to be clear, authorization to practice law does not impact any of the other requirements that may be imposed upon an entity (*e.g.*, business license, tax commission registration, etc.).

4.4 Licensing (Exiting the Sandbox)

Sandbox participants that are able to demonstrate that their legal services are safe—*i.e.*, that they do not cause levels of consumer harm above threshold levels established by the Innovation Office—

may be approved to exit the Sandbox and may be granted the appropriate license to practice law by the Utah Supreme Court pursuant to Utah Supreme Court Rule of Professional Practice 14-802. Such providers and services will remain under the regulatory authority of the Supreme Court, through the Innovation Office and subject to such monitoring and reporting requirements as the terms of the license indicate and subject to the enforcement authority of the Innovation Office.

The Innovation Office will develop the process (subject to Supreme Court approval) by which providers and services exit the Sandbox. It is anticipated that this process will generally follow that outlined for application approval, including an assessment of the provider or service, a finding on the consumer safety of the provider or service, and a recommendation to the Supreme Court as to the scope of the license and associated requirements (e.g., reporting). The Innovation Office is authorized to make the licensing assessment, findings, and recommendations at both the individual or entity level and a more categorical level – i.e., to recommend that a category of legal service providers be licensed to practice law in Utah.

If the Innovation Office does not find that a participant’s proposed legal service furthers the Regulatory Objective or finds that it presents an unacceptable risk of consumer harm, the Innovation Office will deny the proposed licensure, and will include a brief written explanation supporting the finding. The Innovation Office will develop and propose the process for appeal of a denial of Sandbox exit to the Supreme Court.

4.5 Fees

The Innovation Office will have the authority to propose a fee schedule to the Utah Supreme Court. Unless otherwise required, fees paid will be used to fund the Innovation Office.

4.6 Monitoring and Measuring Risk

The Innovation Office will have the authority to develop the measurements by which it assesses and manages risk. The Innovation Office will identify specific harms presenting the most significant risk to the Regulatory Objective. All regulated

providers, whether in the Sandbox or after exiting, have a proactive duty to report any unforeseen risks or harms of which they become aware.

As noted, the Innovation Office will have the authority to develop specific data reporting requirements to monitor consumer risk of harm as part of both Sandbox authorization and general licensing of proposed legal services. The Innovation Office will develop processes and procedures for intake, review, and assessment of incoming data at an individual provider level, across different market sectors, and across the market as a whole. The Innovation Office will have the authority to increase or decrease reporting requirements as indicated by the provider's performance in the market and compliance with the Innovation Office's requirements.

The Innovation Office will have the authority to take proactive actions to effect monitoring of providers and the market as a whole, including but not limited to market surveys, expert audits, anonymous testing, and "secret shopper" tests. The Innovation Office will also develop processes and procedures for intake, review, and assessment of information coming from sources such as media, other governmental or nongovernmental institutions, whistleblowers, and academia.

The Utah Supreme Court acknowledges that this regulatory approach does not remove all possibility of harm from the market and, in fact, contemplates that sometimes there may be no regulatory enforcement action even though some consumers may experience harm. Nevertheless, aggrieved consumers may seek relief and remedy through traditional channels of civil litigation or, if applicable, the criminal justice system.

4.7 Consumer Complaints

The Innovation Office will develop a process by which consumers may directly complain to the Office. The Innovation Office will develop a process by which individual complaint information is fed into the larger data reporting system to contribute to the assessment of risk.

4.8 Enforcement

The Innovation Office will develop standards for enforcement authority upon regulated providers in line with the Regulatory Objective and Regulatory Principles. Enforcement will generally be triggered when the evidence of consumer harm exceeds the applicable acceptable consumer harm threshold. The Innovation Office will also develop the range of enforcement mechanisms it deems appropriate, including but not limited to education, increased reporting requirements, fines, and suspension or termination of authorization or license. Last, the Innovation Office will develop a process for appealing enforcement decisions to the Innovation Office, and then to the Utah Supreme Court.

Once the Innovation Office has developed these various processes and procedures, they will be submitted to the Supreme Court for review and, if appropriate, approval. Both the Supreme Court and the Innovation Office will strive to make the enforcement process as transparent, targeted, and responsive as possible.

4.9 Standards of Conduct

As stated in Rule 5.4(B), lawyers engaging with the nontraditional provision of legal services, as owners, employees, contractors, or business partners with Sandbox participants or licensed providers are required to uphold their duties as required by the Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.10 Confidentiality

The Innovation Office shall maintain a commitment to transparency in the execution of its mission. Identities of applicants to the Sandbox and the applications themselves are presumed to be public information and will be shared via the Innovation Office website.

Applicants may designate appropriate, specific information in the application and/or in any data reported as required by the Innovation Office as confidential business information under the Government Records and Access Management Act (GRAMA). *See* UTAH CODE § 63G-2-305(1)-(2). The Innovation Office will maintain the confidentiality of such designated information and it

will be redacted from the publicly released documents. Nothing, however, in this paragraph limits the ability of the Innovation Office to provide aggregate and anonymized data sets to outside researchers, subject to a duly executed data sharing agreement with the Court.

4.11 Reporting Requirements

The Innovation Office will be responsible for regular reporting to the Utah Supreme Court and the public on the status of the Sandbox, the Sandbox participants, licensed providers, and consumers.

The reports to the Supreme Court must be monthly. Reports to the Supreme Court must include the following:

- The number of applicants
- General information about applicants (e.g., type of legal entity, ownership makeup, target market, proposed type of service, legal need to be addressed, subject matter served)
- Numbers of (along with general information)
 - Applicants recommended for Sandbox entry
 - Applicants denied Sandbox entry
 - Sandbox applicants on hold
 - Applicants recommended to exit Sandbox
 - Applicants not recommended to exit Sandbox
- Numbers and demographic data (as available) on consumers served by the Sandbox and licensed providers
- Identification of risk trends and responses

The Innovation Office will, subject to existing law, have the authority to determine the nature and frequency of its reports to the public, but must, at a minimum, report the information identified above on an annual basis (keeping anonymity and confidentiality as required).

4.12 Jurisdiction

Entities authorized to practice law within the Sandbox and licensed to practice law on exiting the Sandbox are subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. Any false or misleading statements made by entities or their members throughout the regulatory relationship, whether


during application, authorization, reporting, monitoring, or enforcement, whether discovered at the time or at any time afterward, will be independent grounds for enforcement and an aggravating factor in any enforcement proceeding based on other conduct. Any fraudulent or materially misleading statements made by an entity or its members to the Innovation Office or the Court may result in revocation of the entity's authorization to practice law.

4.13 Termination of Pilot Phase

The Sandbox is a policy tool, adopted by the Utah Supreme Court to develop a new regulatory approach to nontraditional legal services and to inform the Supreme Court's decision-making on rule changes necessary to support the expanded legal services market. The Supreme Court has set out a seven-year period of operation for this pilot phase of the Innovation Office and Sandbox.

At the end of the pilot phase, the Supreme Court will determine if and in what form the Innovation Office will continue. Sandbox participants authorized and in good standing at the end of the seven-year period and for whom there appears to be little risk of consumer harm will be able to continue operations under the authority of the Innovation Office or other appropriate entity should the Innovation Office cease to exist. Entities that have successfully exited the Sandbox will be able to continue operations under the authority of the Innovation Office or other appropriate entity should the Innovation Office cease to exist.

July 20, 2021
Date


Matthew B. Durrant
Chief Justice