

**ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION
ETHICS OPINION NO. 2026-2**

Caseloads and Potential Conflicts of Interest

ISSUE PRESENTED

The Committee has been asked to address the ethical considerations for a lawyer who believes they may have a “capacity conflict” under ARPC 1.7(a); *i.e.*, an excessive caseload that materially limits their ability to competently represent all their current clients.¹

SHORT ANSWER

The Committee has elected to adopt ABA Formal Ethics Opinion 06-441 which outlines how lawyers and their supervisors should diagnose and address capacity conflicts created by excessive caseloads.²

ANALYSIS

Alaska Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, 1.2(a), 1.3, and 1.4 require lawyers to competently and diligently represent their clients. In doing so, they must adequately communicate with their clients concerning the subject of the representation,³ educate and inform them of their legal options,⁴ and abide by certain client decisions.⁵ A lawyer must also make “make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with” a client’s interests.⁶

“A lawyer’s work-load must be controlled so that each matter can be handled competently.”⁷ An excessive workload can create a concurrent conflict of interest, or a “capacity conflict.”⁸ When a lawyer’s caseload is

¹ *Off. of Pub. Advoc. v. Superior Ct., First Jud. Dist.*, 566 P.3d 235, 248-249 (Alaska 2025) (holding that a lawyer’s lack of capacity can be a disqualifying concurrent conflict of interest under ARPC 1.7(a)) (hereinafter “OPA”).

² With the permission of the American Bar Association, ABA Formal Opinion 06-411 is attached as an appendix to this opinion.

³ ARPC 1.4(a), (b).

⁴ ARPC 1.4(b).

⁵ ARPC 1.2(a).

⁶ ARPC 3.2.

⁷ ARPC 1.3 cmt.

⁸ OPA., 566 P.3d at 248.

too great, the obligation to competently and diligently represent some clients may materially limit a lawyer's ability to represent other current clients or to take on new clients.⁹ As the Alaska Supreme Court has noted

When an attorney is assigned too many cases, the risk increases that the attorney's ability to represent any one client may be limited by responsibilities to others. As a caseload increases, the attorney's ability to bring to each case the thoroughness and preparation necessary to provide competent representation may diminish. And as the number of assigned cases increases, the attorney's ability to promptly and diligently expedite any one case may decrease.¹⁰

Whether or not a capacity conflict exists "is a difficult judgment" requiring a careful evaluation of the totality of the circumstances pertaining to a lawyer's caseload.¹¹ Caseload studies, such as the Rand National Public Defense Workload Study,¹² can be informative, but should not "be the sole factor in determining if a workload is excessive."¹³ Other relevant factors are "case complexity, the availability of support services, the lawyer's experience and ability, and the lawyer's nonrepresentational duties."¹⁴

ABA Formal Ethics Opinion 06-441 outlines the ethical obligations of a lawyer facing a capacity conflict and identifies the steps that should be taken by a lawyer, and a lawyer's supervisor, to diagnose and resolve such a conflict. The Ethics Committee believes that ABA Formal Ethics Opinion 06-441 provides a reasoned approach to this issue and formally adopts this opinion.

The Ethics Committee believes this opinion addresses the ethical obligations of supervised attorneys and supervising attorneys who represent indigent persons charged with criminal offenses. The Ethics Committee also believes this opinion outlines the ethical obligations

⁹ ARPC 1.7(a)(2).

¹⁰ OPA, 566 P.3d at 249.

¹¹ ABA Formal Ethics Opinion 06-441 at 6 (May 13, 2006).

¹² Nicholas Pace et al., National Public Defense Workload Study, RAND (July 23, 2023), available at https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA2559-1.html (last visited April 14, 2026).

¹³ ABA Formal Ethics Opinion 06-441 at 4.

¹⁴ *Id.*

regarding excessive workloads for all lawyers, including prosecutors, government or court appointed attorneys handling children in need of aid cases, legal aid attorneys, and private practitioners. Workloads must be such that the lawyer can competently and diligently handle the matters assigned.

Approved by the Alaska Bar Association Committee on April 2, 2026.

Adopted by the Board of Governors on April 29, 2026.

ABA Comm. on Ethics & Pro. Resp., Formal Op. 06-411 (2006), is attached hereto, as an appendix.

©2006 by the American Bar Association. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved. This information or any portion thereof may not be copied or disseminated in any form or by any means or stored in an electronic database or retrieval system without the express written consent of the American Bar Association.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Formal Opinion 06-441

May 13, 2006

Ethical Obligations of Lawyers Who Represent Indigent Criminal Defendants When Excessive Caseloads Interfere With Competent and Diligent Representation

All lawyers, including public defenders and other lawyers who, under court appointment or government contract, represent indigent persons charged with criminal offenses, must provide competent and diligent representation. If workload prevents a lawyer from providing competent and diligent representation to existing clients, she must not accept new clients. If the clients are being assigned through a court appointment system, the lawyer should request that the court not make any new appointments. Once the lawyer is representing a client, the lawyer must move to withdraw from representation if she cannot provide competent and diligent representation. If the court denies the lawyer's motion to withdraw, and any available means of appealing such ruling is unsuccessful, the lawyer must continue with the representation while taking whatever steps are feasible to ensure that she will be able to competently and diligently represent the defendant.

Lawyer supervisors, including heads of public defenders' offices and those within such offices having intermediate managerial responsibilities, must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyers in the office conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct. To that end, lawyer supervisors must, working closely with the lawyers they supervise, monitor the workload of the supervised lawyers to ensure that the workloads do not exceed a level that may be competently handled by the individual lawyers.

In this opinion,¹ we consider the ethical responsibilities of lawyers, whether employed in the capacity of public defenders or otherwise, who represent indigent persons charged with criminal offenses, when the lawyers' workloads prevent them from providing competent and diligent representa-

1. This opinion is based on the Model Rules of Professional Conduct as amended by the ABA House of Delegates through August 2003. The laws, court rules, regulations, rules of professional conduct and opinions promulgated in the individual jurisdictions are controlling.

tion to all their clients. Excessive workloads present issues for both those who represent indigent defendants and the lawyers who supervise them.²

Ethical responsibilities of a public defender³ in regard to individual workload

Persons charged with crimes have a constitutional right to the effective assistance of counsel.⁴ Generally, if a person charged with a crime is unable to afford a lawyer, he is constitutionally entitled to have a lawyer appointed to represent him.⁵ The states have attempted to satisfy this constitutional mandate through various methods, such as establishment of public defender, court appointment, and contract systems.⁶ Because these systems have been created to provide representation for a virtually unlimited number of indigent criminal defendants, the lawyers employed to provide representation generally are limited in their ability to control the number of clients they are assigned. Measures have been adopted in some jurisdictions in attempts to control workloads,⁷ including the establishment of procedures for assigning cases to lawyers outside public defenders' offices when the cases could not properly be directed to a public defender, either because of a conflict of interest or for other reasons.

2. For additional discussion of the problems presented by excessive caseloads for public defenders, see "Gideon's Broken Promise: American's Continuing Quest For Equal Justice," prepared by the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants 29 (ABA 2004), available at <http://www.abanet.org/legalservices/sclaid/defender/brokenpromise/fullreport.pdf> (last visited June 21, 2006).

3. The term "public defender" as used here means both a lawyer employed in a public defender's office and any other lawyer who represents, pursuant to court appointment or government contract, indigent persons charged with criminal offenses.

4. U.S. CONST. amends. VI & XIV.

5. The United States Supreme Court has interpreted the Sixth Amendment to require the appointment of counsel in any state and federal criminal prosecution that, regardless of whether for a misdemeanor or felony, leads or may lead to imprisonment for any period of time. See generally, *Alabama v. Shelton*, 535 U.S. 654, 662 (2002); *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 684-86 (1984); *Scott v. Illinois*, 440 U.S. 367, 373-74 (1979); *Argersinger v. Hamlin*, 407 U.S. 25, 30-31 (1972); *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335, 342-45 (1963); *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458, 462-63 (1938).

6. Most states deliver indigent defense services using a public defender's office (eighteen states) or a combination of public defender, assigned counsel, and contract defender (another twenty-nine states), according to the Spangenberg Group, which developed a report on behalf of the ABA Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants. See The Spangenberg Group, "Statewide Indigent Defense Systems: 2005," available at <http://www.abanet.org/legalservices/downloads/sclaid/indigentdefense/statewideinddefsystems2005.pdf> (last visited June 21, 2006).

7. See generally, National Symposium on Indigent Defense 2000, *Redefining Leadership for Equal Justice, A Conference Report* (U.S. Dep't of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Wash. D.C.) 3 (June 29-30, 2000), available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/indigentdefense/symposium.pdf> (last visited June 21, 2006) (common problem in indigent defense delivery systems is that "lawyers often have unmanageable caseloads (700 or more in a year)").

Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, 1.2(a), 1.3, and 1.4 require lawyers to provide competent representation, abide by certain client decisions, exercise diligence, and communicate with the client concerning the subject of representation.⁸ These obligations include, but are not limited to, the responsibilities to keep abreast of changes in the law; adequately investigate, analyze, and prepare cases; act promptly on behalf of clients; communicate effectively on behalf of and with clients; control workload so each matter can be handled competently; and, if a lawyer is not experienced with or knowledgeable about a specific area of the law, either associate with counsel who is knowledgeable in the area or educate herself about the area. The Rules provide no exception for lawyers who represent indigent persons charged with crimes.⁹

8. Rule 1.1(a) provides that “[a] lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.”

Rule 1.2(a) states:

[A] lawyer shall abide by a client’s decisions concerning the objectives of representation and, as required by Rule 1.4, shall consult with the client as to the means by which they are to be pursued. A lawyer may take such action on behalf of the client as is impliedly authorized to carry out the representation. A lawyer shall abide by a client’s decision whether to settle a matter. In a criminal case, the lawyer shall abide by the client’s decision, after consultation with the lawyer, as to a plea to be entered, whether to waive jury trial and whether the client will testify.

Rule 1.3 states that “[a] lawyer shall act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client.”

Rule 1.4(a) and (b) 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.

9. See ABA Formal Opinion Op. 347 (Dec. 1, 1981) (Ethical Obligations of Lawyers to Clients of Legal Services Offices When Those Offices Lose Funding), in FORMAL AND INFORMAL ETHICS OPINIONS, FORMAL OPINIONS 316-348, INFORMAL OPINIONS 1285-1495 at 139 (ABA 1985) (duties owed to existing clients include duty of adequate preparation and a duty of competent representation); ABA Informal Op. 1359 (June 4, 1976) (Use of Waiting Lists or Priorities by Legal Service Officer), *id.* at 237 (same); ABA Informal Op. 1428 (Sept. 12, 1979) (Lawyer-Client Relationship Between the Individual and Legal Services Office: Duty of Office Toward Client When Attorney Representing Him (Her) Leaves the Office and Withdraws from the Case), *id.* at 326 (all lawyers, including legal services lawyers, are subject to mandatory duties owed by lawyers to existing clients, including duty of adequate preparation

Comment 2 to Rule 1.3 states that a lawyer's workload "must be controlled so that each matter may be handled competently."¹⁰ The Rules do not prescribe a formula to be used in determining whether a particular workload is excessive. National standards as to numerical caseload limits have been cited by the American Bar Association.¹¹ Although such standards may be considered, they are not the sole factor in determining if a workload is excessive. Such a determination depends not only on the number of cases, but also on such factors as case complexity, the availability of support services, the lawyer's experience and ability, and the lawyer's nonrepresentational duties.¹² If a lawyer believes that her workload is such that she is unable to meet the basic ethical obligations required of her in the representation of a client, she must not continue the representation of that client or, if representation has not yet begun, she must decline the representation.¹³

A lawyer's primary ethical duty is owed to existing clients.¹⁴ Therefore, a

and competent representation). *See also* South Carolina Bar Ethics Adv. Op. 04-12 (Nov. 12, 2004) (all lawyers, including public defenders, have ethical obligation not to undertake caseload that leads to violation of professional conduct rules).

The applicability of Rules 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 to public defenders and/or prosecutors has been recognized by ethics advisory committees in at least one other state. *See* Va. Legal Eth. Op. 1798 (Aug. 3, 2004) (duties of competence and diligence contained within rules of professional conduct apply equally to all lawyers, including prosecutors).

10. Principle 5 of *The Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System* specifically addresses the workload of criminal defense lawyers:

Defense counsel's workload is controlled to permit the rendering of quality representation. Counsel's workload, including appointed and other work, should never be so large as to interfere with the rendering of quality representation or lead to the breach of ethical obligations, and counsel is obligated to decline appointments above such levels. National caseload standards should in no event be exceeded, but the concept of workload (i.e., caseload adjusted by factors such as case complexity, support services, and an attorney's nonrepresentational duties) is a more accurate measurement.

Report to the ABA House of Delegates No. 107 (adopted Feb. 5, 2002), *available at* <http://www.abanet.org/legalservices/downloads/sclaid/10principles.pdf> (last visited June 21, 2006) (emphasis in original).

11. *Id.*

12. *Id.* *See also* Attorney Grievance Comm'n of Maryland v. Ficker, 706 A.2d 1045, 1051-52 (1998) (supervising lawyer violated Rule 5.1 by assigning too many cases to supervised lawyer, assigning cases day before trial, and assigning cases too complex for supervised lawyer's level of experience and ability).

13. Rule 1.16(a) states that "a lawyer shall not represent a client or, where representation has begun, shall withdraw from the representation of a client if the representation will result in violation of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct or other law."

14. *See* ABA Formal Opinion Op. 96-399 (Jan. 18, 1996) (Ethical Obligations of Lawyers Whose Employers Receive Funds from the Legal Services Corporation to their Existing and Future Clients When Such Funding is Reduced and When Remaining Funding is Subject to Restrictive Conditions), in *FORMAL AND INFORMAL ETHICS OPINIONS 1983-1998* at 369 (ABA 2000); ABA Formal Opinion Op. 347, *supra* note 9.

lawyer must decline to accept new cases, rather than withdraw from existing cases, if the acceptance of a new case will result in her workload becoming excessive. When an existing workload does become excessive, the lawyer must reduce it to the extent that what remains to be done can be handled in full compliance with the Rules.

When a lawyer receives appointments directly from the court rather than as a member of a public defender's office or law firm that receives the appointment, she should take appropriate action if she believes that her workload will become, or already is, excessive. Such action may include the following:

- requesting that the court refrain from assigning the lawyer any new cases until such time as the lawyer's existing caseload has been reduced to a level that she is able to accept new cases and provide competent legal representation; and
- if the excessive workload cannot be resolved simply through the court's not assigning new cases, the lawyer should file a motion with the trial court requesting permission to withdraw from a sufficient number of cases to allow the provision of competent and diligent representation to the remaining clients.¹⁵

If the lawyer has sought court permission to withdraw from the representation and that permission has been denied, the lawyer must take all feasible steps to assure that the client receives competent representation.

When a lawyer receives appointments as a member of a public defender's office or law firm, the appropriate action to be taken by the lawyer to reduce an excessive workload might include, with approval of the lawyer's supervisor:

- transferring non-representational responsibilities within the office, including managerial responsibilities, to others;
- refusing new cases;¹⁶ and
- transferring current case(s) to another lawyer whose workload will allow for the transfer of the case(s).¹⁷

15. Whenever a lawyer seeks to withdraw from a representation the client should be notified, even if court rules do not require such notification. *See* Rule 1.4.

16. It should be noted that a public defender's attempt to avoid appointment or to withdraw from a case must be based on valid legal grounds. Rule 6.2(a) provides, in pertinent part, that "[a] lawyer *shall not seek to avoid* appointment by a tribunal to represent a person *except for good cause*, such as representing the client is likely to result in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law." (Emphasis added). Therefore, a public defender should not claim an excessive workload in an attempt to avoid new cases or to withdraw from current cases unless good cause objectively exists.

17. It is important to note that, for purposes of the Model Rules, a public defender's office, much like a legal services office, is considered to be the equivalent of a law firm. *See* Rule 1.0(c). Unless a court specifically names an individual lawyer within a public defender's office to represent an indigent defendant, the public defender's office should be considered as a firm assigned to represent the client; responsibility for handling the case falls upon the office as a whole. *See* ABA Informal Op. 1428, *supra* note 9 (legal services agency should be considered firm retained by client; responsibility for handling caseload of departing legal services lawyer falls upon office as whole rather than upon lawyer who is departing). Therefore, cases may ethically be reassigned within a public defender's office.

If the supervisor fails to provide appropriate assistance or relief, the lawyer should continue to advance up the chain of command within the office until either relief is obtained or the lawyer has reached and requested assistance or relief from the head of the public defender's office.

In presenting these options, the Committee recognizes that whether a public defender's workload is excessive often is a difficult judgment requiring evaluation of factors such as the complexity of the lawyer's cases and other factors.¹⁸ When a public defender consults her supervisor and the supervisor makes a conscientious effort to deal with workload issues, the supervisor's resolution ordinarily will constitute a "reasonable resolution of an arguable question of professional duty" as discussed in Rule 5.2(b).¹⁹ In those cases where the supervisor's resolution is not reasonable, however, the public defender must take further action.²⁰

Such further action might include:

- if relief is not obtained from the head of the public defender's office, appealing to the governing board, if any, of the public defender's office;²¹ and
- if the lawyer is still not able to obtain relief,²² filing a motion with the trial court requesting permission to withdraw from a sufficient number of cases to allow the provision of competent and diligent representation to the remaining clients.²³

If the public defender is not allowed to withdraw from representation, she must obey the court's order while taking all steps reasonably feasible to insure that her client receives competent and diligent representation.²⁴

18. See note 12, *supra*, and accompanying text.

19. See Comment [2].

20. See, e.g., *Atty. Grievance Comm'n of Maryland v. Kahn*, 431 A.2d 1336, 1352 (1981) ("Obviously, the high ethical standards and professional obligations of an attorney may never be breached because an attorney's employer may direct such a course of action on pain of dismissal. . . .")

21. See Michigan Bar Committee on Prof. & Jud. Eth. Op. RI-252 (Mar. 1, 1996) (in context of civil legal services agency, if subordinate lawyer receives no relief from excessive workload from lawyer supervisor, she should, under Rule 1.13(b) and (c), take the matter to legal services board for resolution).

22. Rule 5.2 makes clear that subordinate lawyers are not insulated from violating the Rules of Professional Conduct and suffering the consequences merely because they acted in accordance with a supervisory lawyer's advice or direction unless it was in regard to "an arguable question of professional duty."

23. A public defender filing a motion to withdraw under these circumstances should provide the court with information necessary to justify the withdrawal, while being mindful of the obligations not to disclose confidential information or information as to strategy or other matters that may prejudice the client. See Rule 1.16 cmt. 3.

24. Notwithstanding the lawyer's duty in this circumstance to continue in the representation and to make every attempt to render the client competent representation, the lawyer nevertheless may pursue any available means of review of the court's order. See *Iowa Supreme Court Bd. of Prof. Ethics & Conduct v. Hughes*, 557 N.W.2d 890, 894

Ethical responsibility of a lawyer who supervises a public defender

Rule 5.1 provides that lawyers who have managerial authority, including those with intermediate managerial responsibilities, over the professional work of a firm or public sector legal agency or department shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyers in the agency or department conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct. Rule 5.1 requires that lawyers having direct supervisory authority take reasonable steps to ensure that lawyers in the office they supervise are acting diligently in regard to all legal matters entrusted to them, communicating appropriately with the clients on whose cases they are working, and providing competent representation to their clients. As an essential first step, the supervisor must monitor the workloads of subordinate lawyers to ensure that the workload of each lawyer is appropriate. This involves consideration of the type and complexity of cases being handled by each lawyer; the experience and ability of each lawyer; the resources available to support her, and any non-representational responsibilities assigned to the subordinate lawyers.

If any subordinate lawyer's workload is found to be excessive, the supervisor should take whatever additional steps are necessary to ensure that the subordinate lawyer is able to meet her ethical obligations in regard to the representation of her clients. These might include the following:

- transferring the lawyer's non-representational responsibilities, including managerial responsibilities, to others in the office;
- transferring case(s) to another lawyer or other lawyers whose workload will allow them to provide competent representation;²⁵
- if there are no other lawyers within the office who can take over the cases from which the individual lawyer needs to withdraw, supporting the lawyer's efforts to withdraw from the representation of the client;²⁶ and finally,
- if the court will not allow the lawyer to withdraw from representation, providing the lawyer with whatever additional resources can be made available to assist her in continuing to represent the client(s) in a manner consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct.

(Iowa 1996) ("ignoring a court order is simply not an appropriate step to test the validity of the order under our Code of Professional Responsibility"); Utah Bar Eth. Adv. Op. 107 (Feb. 15, 1992) (if grounds exist to decline court appointment, lawyer should not disobey order but should seek review by appeal or other available procedure).

25. See note 17, *supra*.

26. See *In re Order on Prosecution of Criminal Appeals by Tenth Judicial Circuit Public Defender*, 561 So.2d 1130, 1138-39 (Fla. 1990) (in context of inadequate funding, court stated that if "the backlog of cases in the public defender's office is so excessive that there is no possible way he can timely handle those cases, it is his responsibility to move the court to withdraw"); see also *In re Order on Motions to Withdraw Filed by Tenth Circuit Public Defender*, 612 So.2d 597 (Fla. App. 1992) (en banc) (public defender's office entitled to withdraw due to excessive caseload from representing defendants in one hundred forty-three cases).

When a supervised lawyer's workload is excessive and, notwithstanding any other efforts made by her supervisor to address the problem, it is obviously incumbent upon the supervisor to assign no additional cases to the lawyer, and, if the lawyer's cases come by assignment from the court, to support the lawyer's efforts to have no new cases assigned to her by the court until such time as she can adequately fulfill her ethical responsibilities to her existing clients.

In dealing with workload issues, supervisors frequently must balance competing demands for scarce resources. As Comment [2] to Rule 5.2 observes, if the question of whether a lawyer's workload is too great is "reasonably arguable," the supervisor of the lawyer has the authority to decide the question. In the final analysis, however, each client is entitled to competent and diligent representation. If a supervisor knows that a subordinate's workload renders the lawyer unable to provide competent and diligent representation and the supervisor fails to take reasonable remedial action, under Rule 5.1(c),²⁷ the supervisor himself is responsible for the subordinate's violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.²⁸

27. Rule 5.1(c) states:

(c) A lawyer shall be responsible for another lawyer's violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct if: (1) the lawyer orders or, with 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 other lawyer practices, or has direct supervisory authority over the other lawyer, and knows of the conduct at a time when its consequences can be avoided or mitigated but fails to take reasonable remedial action.

See also Rules 1.16 (a) and 8.4 (a).

28. See, e.g., Attorney Grievance Comm'n of Maryland v. Ficker, 706 A.2d at 1052, *supra* note 12); Va. Legal Ethics Op. 1798 *supra* note 9 (lawyer supervisor who assigns caseload that is so large as to prevent lawyer from ethically representing clients would violate Rule 5.1); American Council of Chief Defenders, Nat'l Legal Aid and Defender Ass'n Eth. Op. 03-01 (April 2003), available at <http://www.nlada.org/DMS/Documents/1082573112.32/ACCD%20Ethics%20opinion%20on%20Workloads.pdf> (last visited June 21, 2006) ("chief executive of an agency providing public defense services is ethically prohibited from accepting a number of cases which exceeds the capacity of the agency's attor-

a prospective overloading of cases or reductions in funding or staffing which will cause the agency's attorneys to exceed such capacity, the chief executive of a public defense agency is ethically required to refuse appointment to any and all such excess cases."); Wisconsin State Bar Prof. Ethics Comm. Op. E-91-3 (1991) (assigning caseload that exceeds recognized maximum caseload standards, and that would not allow subordinate public defender to conform to rules of professional conduct, "could result in a violation of disciplinary standards"); Ariz. Op. No. 90-10 (Sept. 17, 1990) ("when a Public Defender has knowledge that subordinate lawyers, because of their caseloads, cannot comply with their duties of diligence and competence, the Public Defender must take action."); Wisconsin State Bar Prof. Ethics Comm. Op. E-84-11 (1984) (supervisors in public defender's office may not ethically increase workloads of subordinate lawyers to point where subordinate lawyer cannot, even at personal sacrifice, handle each of her clients' matters competently and in non-neglectful manner).

Conclusion

The obligations of competence, diligence, and communication under the Rules apply equally to every lawyer. All lawyers, including public defenders, have an ethical obligation to control their workloads so that every matter they undertake will be handled competently and diligently. If a lawyer's workload is such that the lawyer is unable to provide competent and diligent representation to existing or potential clients, the lawyer should not accept new clients. If the problem of an excessive workload cannot be resolved through the non-acceptance of new clients or by other available measures, the lawyer should move to withdraw as counsel in existing cases to the extent necessary to bring the workload down to a manageable level, while at all times attempting to limit the prejudice to any client from whose case the lawyer has withdrawn. If permission of a court is required to withdraw from representation and permission is refused, the lawyer's obligations under the Rules remain: the lawyer must continue with the representation while taking whatever steps are feasible to ensure that she will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to the defendant.

Supervisors, including the head of a public defender's office and those within such an office having intermediate managerial responsibilities, must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the other lawyers in the office conform to the Rules of Professional Conduct. To that end, supervisors must, working with the lawyers they supervise, monitor the workload of the subordinate lawyers to ensure that the workloads are not allowed to exceed that which may be handled by the individual lawyers. If a supervisor knows that a subordinate's workload renders the lawyer unable to provide competent and diligent representation and the supervisor fails to take reasonable remedial action, the supervisor is responsible for the subordinate's violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.