International Journal of Academic Research and Development
ISSN: 2455-4197
Impact Factor: RJIF 5.22
www.academicsjournal.com
Volume 3; Issue 1; January 2018; Page No. 848-852

The use of legal software by non-lawyers and the perils of unauthorized practice of law charges in the United States: A review of Jayson Reynoso decision

Pranav Ranga
Assistant Professor, Institute of Law Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Abstract
This paper basically surveys the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit In re: Jayson Reynoso: Frankfort Digital Services *et al*., v. Sara L. Kistler, United States Trustee *et al*. (2007). The appellants, who were non-lawyers, were prosecuted with unauthorized practice of law for offering bankruptcy petition services by means of online legal software or expert systems in law designed for recording bankruptcy petition shapes. The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit discovered bury alia that appellants were bankruptcy petition preparers, and not being lawyers, had surpassed their administrative dispatch by offering legal advice and legal services in negation of California law controlling legal practice and 11 U.S.C. Group. 110 of the Bankruptcy Code (2002) while analyzing the legal consequences of the utilization of legal software by non-lawyers in the arrangement of legal archives, the paper basically audits the factual circum-positions of the Reynoso choice with regards to juridical and statutory develops of unauthorized practice of law in the United States. The paper offers the conversation starter whether Reynoso ought to be seen as an erratic choice bound by its impossible to miss facts, or great law for the expansive recommendation that non-lawyers can't utilize legal software in legal archives readiness. The paper additionally noticed the conceivable legal boundaries to an unequivocal prohibition on the plan, deal, circulation, and employments of legal software by non-lawyers. These range from the First Amendment right to free speech, constitutional right to expert se legal portrayal, interstate commerce doctrine, to hostile to trust arrangements of the Sherman Act. An administration of best practices for the utilization of legal software or expert systems in law by non-lawyers is proffered.

Keywords: United States Court, judgment, Jayson Reynoso decision

Introduction
In Great Britain, the Law Society's select imposing business model on conveyancing services was extricated in 1987. This stands out strongly from the United States, where the legal calling enviously monitors its turf by fencing-off non-lawyers from conveyancing, legal records readiness, or any activities that are seen as the customary jelly of lawyers or statutorily characterized as the practice of law Ostensibly, the principle strategy method of reasoning for this restriction is legal services quality confirmation and the
insurance of general society from unfit legal practitioners, who while appropriating the full advantages of legal practice, frequently shun the comparing obligations that customarily support the lawyer and customer relationship. For instance, the British firm, Desktop Lawyer, which offers altered on the web and disconnected legal reports for individual and business clients by means of its "Rapidocs" software, works a disclaimer approach that explicitly exculpates the firm from any obligation related with the utilization of its "astute" legal records. Likewise Legal Zoom, a comparative online firm situated in the United States, which offers legal data and records. It depicts itself as a supplier of legal archive services, and would not be drawn into "a lawyer customer relationship" with its clients. The previously mentioned firms' hesitance to accept accountability for any obligation emerging from their semi legal services or go into any classified connections much the same as that of lawyer and customer relationship, is ostensibly educated by the guidelines disallowing lay people from speaking to themselves as lawyers.
And, after its all said and done, the boldness of non-lawyers taking advantage of legal or semi legal services, while repudiating obligation regarding liabilities emerging from their activities, has filled feelings of hatred from adversaries. For instance, while criticizing the invasions of bookkeepers on lawyers' turf, Gibeaut contended that bookkeepers proved unable "offer wide running classification or unwaveringness and the insurances that those obligations attempt to ensure", and cautioned that if lawmakers would not stop bookkeepers' fiddling with legal practice, the legal calling would wind up plainly undefined from bookkeeping additional time. Gibeaut's perspectives are yet symptomatic of the savage professional turf fencing (frequently rightly invigorated by prescriptive instructive preparing and necessary expert enrollment) that for the most part characterizes the callings, for example, pharmaceutical.

Legal Software or Expert Systems in Law Defined
As a rule terms, expert systems are an amalgam of computerized reasoning and particular group of learning designed to execute undertakings, take care of issues, and proffer advice that is generally the right of human knowledge. In the domain of legal data science, expert systems in law or

legal software are particularly customized for legal data recovery, legal thinking and issues tackling, drawing on basic legal database asset or information. Despite the fact that the utilization of expert systems in law for judicial choice help, legal data management and recovery by judges, legal scholastics and lawyers is hallowed, its utilization for legal thinking and advice has not yet been satisfactorily customized, and have had generally restricted victories. By the by, expert systems in law or legal software programs offering commercial on the web and disconnected PC intervened legal services are currently universal with accompanying legal externalities, going from malpractice dangers for lawyers, breaking of multi-jurisdictional practice confinement rules, to potential charges of unauthorized practice of law for non-lawyers in the United States.

The Decision

1. The ruling of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California

The Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California decided entomb alia that appellants were bankruptcy petition preparers, and being non-lawyers, had occupied with unauthorized practice of law. Appellants' contention in actuality that they just possessed a site, which enabled access to bankruptcy software by debtors over the United States, was dismissed by the Bankruptcy Court as takes after:

Sites don't simply become out of nowhere and aren't kept up out of nowhere. They're assembled by individuals; they're put on the Internet; and it's not the site that gives the help. The general population create site that give the help.

2. The ruling of the United States Bankruptcy Appellate Panel for the Ninth Circuit

In the Appeal before the United States Bankruptcy Appellate Panel for the Ninth Circuit, the principle issues for assurance were: First, regardless of whether the Bankruptcy Court blundered in holding that appellants were bankruptcy petition preparers. Second, regardless of whether the Bankruptcy Court blundered in holding that appellants occupied with unauthorized practice of law. Third, regardless of whether the Bankruptcy Court failed in holding that appellants were occupied with false, uncalled for, or beguiling behavior and whether the appealing party should discount all charges paid for the utilization of the bankruptcy software.43 The Bankruptcy Appellate Panel insisted the judgment of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California, and held entomb alia that appellants were bankruptcy petition preparers under 11 U.S.C. Organization.

3. The ruling of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Disappointed with the judgment of the Appellate Panel, the appellants additionally spoke to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. On the topic of whether appellants were insolvency request of preparers, the Court of Appeals broadly inspected the arrangements of 11 U.S.C. Group. 110(a) (1) of the U.S. Chapter 11 Code which characterizes a liquidation request of preparer as "… a man, other than a lawyer or a worker of a lawyer, who gets ready for pay an archive for recording." The Court of Appeals dismissed appellants' contention that "… the creation and responsibility for software program utilized by a licensee to set up his or her insolvency frames isn't readiness of a report for documenting under the statute," and held that the software at issue qualified as a liquidation request of preparer.

Discussion

The germane inquiry is whether Reynoso is great law for an expansive recommendation that non-lawyers can't utilize expert systems in law or legal software in the United States? Ostensibly, the appropriate response would constantly rely upon the factual conditions of each case on the grounds that, and essentially, neither the facts of the case nor the choice of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit explicitly approve such an expansive suggestion. The Court actually declined to express any perspectives on whether the utilization of legal software alone, or different kinds of PC projects would in that capacity constitute the practice of law. Notwithstanding, the Court observed that the chapter 11 software in Reynoso gave more than administrative services via naturally figuring out where to put data gave by the debtor and providing legal references. This as per the Court added up to legal reports arrangement and offering of legal advice.

The software did, in fact, go a long ways past giving administrative services. It figured out where (especially, in which plan) to put data gave by the debtor, chose exceptions for the debtor and provided applicable legal references. Giving such customized direction has been held to constitute the practice of law.

1. Outright ban on non-lawyer use of legal software by States' legislations could likely impinge on federal antitrust laws

The Sherman Antitrust Act by and large disallows people from making any contract or taking part in any mix or scheme in limitation of exchange or commerce, or consuming exchange among States. Be that as it may, States are for the most part invulnerable from the arrangements of the Sherman Act, through the judicially made state action exclusion doctrine as upheld by the US Supreme Court in the 1943 instance of Parker v. Dark colored.

The strategy basic the state action exception doctrine is the conservation of the standards of federalism that would enable states to pass enactments, which though with anticompetitive twisted, are intended to ensure the welfare of their separate nationals. Be that as it may, the state action exception doctrine isn't totally inadequate, and a concise survey of the facts of Parker v. Dark colored is germane to completely get a handle on the importance of the doctrine for the examination of the conceivable antitrust hindrance to a general prohibition on the non-lawyer utilization of legal software.

In Parker, the California governing body endorsed an advertising program for agricultural wares in accordance with the California Agricultural Prorate Act, which by and large confined the way that raisins makers could showcase their products. In particular, the enactment set a confinement on rivalry among raisins cultivators, and controlled the costs at which raisins were sold to packers who handled and sold the

raisins on intestate markets. The primary targets of the Act were to ration California's agricultural wealth and counteract monetary waste in the promoting of agricultural yields. The appellee, who was a maker and raisins packer, tested the enactment on grounds that it encroached on the antitrust arrangements of the Sherman Act.

2. General ban on non-lawyer use of legal software could run afoul of the constitutional commerce clause doctrine

A related snag to the states' unauthorized routine with regards to law enactments out rightly precluding non-lawyers from utilizing legal software or expert systems in law, is the Constitutional Commerce Clause arrangements of article 1, Sect. 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which engages Congress to control commerce and exchange broadly and globally. The Beer Institute, the US Supreme Court held that "this certifiable concede of specialist to Congress likewise includes a verifiable or 'dormant' constraint on the expert of the states to order enactment influencing interstate commerce." The Supreme Court had before communicated comparable perspectives in its choice in Parker v. Darker, when it noticed that:

The legislatures of the states are sovereign inside their domain spare just as they are liable to the disallowances of the Constitution or as their activity in some measure clashes with powers designated to the National Government, or with Congressional enactment instituted in the activity of those forces…

In this way, the amusingness of government laws over states laws is essential to the smooth workings of the US federalism, and the Commerce Clause is the reason for a considerable length of time of statute that forbids states from controlling in ways that could hamper interstate commerce even without Congressional activity. The guideline has been connected in different commercial settings by the US Supreme Court with shifted results (occasioned generally by the particular certainties of each case) that either precluded the State enactment being referred to as unconstitutional, or that vindicated it of any negation of the Commerce Clause. For instance in Parker v. Darker, the Court held that the California Agricultural Prorate Act.

3. Pro se legal representation and legal software or expert systems in law

However another potential snag to a state's unauthorized routine with regards to law enactment that out rightly precludes the utilization of legal software by non-lawyers is the residents' constitutional rights to genius se legal portrayal. The right was re-avowed by the US Supreme Court in Anthony Faretta v. California, where the Court held that criminal litigants had a constitutional right to decline direct and speak to themselves in courts. Truth be told, most States have constitutional, evidentiary, or procedural tenets ensuring natives' right to ace se legal portrayal in courts. The 2002 Federal Bankruptcy Code is an applicable case of a Federal law that takes into account expert se legal portrayal in Bankruptcy cases. In this way, non-lawyers could legally utilize liquidation legal software to get ready and record their own particular insolvency petitions. In a similar vein, any ace se prosecutors would have the capacity to legally utilize any applicable legal software in the indictment of their civil or criminal cases in courts. In this manner, any unauthorized routine with regards to law statute that by and large precludes non-lawyer employments of legal software could ruin professional se prosecutors' entrance to legal software and in a roundabout way encroach on their constitutional right to self legal portrayal in courts.

4. The constitutionality of prohibiting the programming, manufacturing, distributing, and selling of legal software by unauthorized practice of law statutes

Another potential hindrance is the constitutionality of disallowing or limiting the programming or manufacturing, offering or circulating of legal software by non-lawyers, on grounds of conceivable infringement of unauthorized routine with regards to law statutes. As noted before, the Court of Appeals in Reynoso held bury alia that the legal software being referred to qualified as an insolvency request of preparer, in light of the fact that it provided legal references and naturally figured out where non-lawyers clients should put pertinent information. This is because of the way that by its exceptionally nature, legal software is customized to process the realities sustained into it, and create fitting legal instruments and directions on the most proficient method to utilize it, accordingly achieving everything that a lawyer would regularly do.118 It is along these lines questionable that legal software, being smart systems, is ipso facto an epitomized legal advice or a gadget that could suo motu proffer legal advice.

Statutory and Judicial Constructs Of Unauthorised Practice of Law Legislations: A Conundrum

On the off chance that anything, the Parsons Technology case exhibits the natural vagueness in the statutory origination and legal develops of the importance of 'unauthorized routine with regards to law' in the United States. This equivocalness makes everything the more troublesome for lucid legal investigations of when the utilization of legal software by non-lawyers would encroach unauthorized routine with regards to law enactments. Despite the fact that the Texas authoritative amendment mixed the level headed discussion with relative assurance, and conveyed prompt conclusion to the Parsons Technology case, non-lawyers making, offering, disseminating, or utilizing legal software are ostensibly defenseless against unauthorized routine with regards to law charges in different states without the Texas-type contingent statutory exclusion.

Without question, the meaning of what constitutes the act of law in the United States has quite often radiated legal and political implications while its juridical and statutory builds regularly fluctuate from locale to purview. For instance, prior endeavors by the American Bar Association at directing unauthorized legal practice by means of an administration of "Statement of Principles" were solidly opposed, and held violative of antitrust controls by the US Supreme Court.

The primary worst thing about managing unauthorized routine with regards to law exercises lays in the trouble of conceptualizing the correct parameters of what constitute the

act of law. Because of natural statutory vagueness, Judges in the United States have been similarly flummoxed and unfit to nail down the correct significance of what the act of law is, and have tended to take "a specially appointed approach" to deconstructing the term. For instance, in the Reynoso case the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit recognized the recalcitrance of the term, which California courts have acknowledged as including "… legal advice and guide and the planning of legal instruments and gets." The Court of Appeals at that point drew on the before California instance of Baron v. Los Angeles, where the court opined that "discovering whether a specific movement falls inside this general definition might be a considerable endeavor.''

Conclusion

This paper fundamentally examinations the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Reynoso case. The appellants, who were non-lawyers, were prosecuted with unauthorized routine with regards to law for offering chapter 11 request of services by means of master systems in law designed for recording insolvency appeal to frames. The Court of Appeals discovered entomb alia that appellants were chapter 11 request of preparers, and that they had surpassed their administrative transmit by offering legal advice and legal services in negation of California law controlling legal practice and 11 U.S.C. Order. 110 of the Bankruptcy Code (2002). While looking at the legal repercussions of the utilization of legal software or master systems in law by non-lawyers, the paper fundamentally surveys the accurate conditions of Reynoso choice with regards to juridical and statutory builds of unauthorized routine with regards to law in the United States. The paper sets that the Reynoso choice ought to be seen as an erratic choice bound by its unconventional realities, and not great law for the wide recommendation that non-lawyers can't utilize master systems in law.

The paper however noticed the thin limits set by Reynoso, inside which non-lawyers could utilize legal software. Be that as it may, while Reynoso gives legal direction on how non-lawyers could utilize legal software, (except for the province of Texas) there is no across the nation statutory direction on whether the deal or conveyance of legal software would constitute unauthorized routine with regards to law. The paper additionally takes note of that any endeavors to undermine the general utilization of legal software by non-lawyers could raise constitutional and legal hindrances running from antitrust arrangements of the Sherman Act, the right to ace se legal portrayal, constitutional commerce clause doctrine, to the First Amendment right to free speech. It is recommended that each state receives the model meaning of the act of law that is similar to that of the territory of Texas, which unmistakably exempts the offer of legal software from unauthorized routine with regards to law, furnished this is combined with express and obvious disclaimer that the software is not a viable alternative for legal advice. This would give a statutory definitional assurance, similarly that Reynoso case, to some degree, gives legal sureness on the extent of non-lawyer utilization of legal software in the United States.

References

1. Adelman M. Cases and materials on patent law. West Group, St. Paul, 1998, 105.
2. Denckla D. Nonlawyers and the unauthorized practice of law: an overview of the legal and ethical parameters. Fordham Law Rev. 1999; 67:2585
3. Fischer J. Policing the self-help legal market: consumer protection or protection of legal cartel? Indiana Law Rev 2000-2001; 34:121-153at138-139
4. Gibeaut J. Squeeze play: as accountants edge into the legal market, lawyers may find themselves not only blinded by the assault but also limited by professional rules. ABA J. 1998; 84:42-47.
5. Glass G, Jackson K. The unauthorized practice of law: the internet, alternative dispute resolution, and multidisciplinary practice. Georgetown J Leg Ethics. 2000, 2001; 14:1195-1210
6. Justice K. There goes the monopoly: the California proposal to allow non-lawyers to practice law. Vanderbilt Law Rev. 1991; 44:184-185.
7. Lanctot C. Scriveners in cyberspace: online documents preparation and the unauthorized practice of law. Hofstra Law Rev. 2002; 30:811-854.
8. Leef G. Lawyer fees too much? The case for repealing unauthorized practice of law statutes. Regul Cato Rev Bus Gov, 1997; 20(1). Available at http://www.cato.org. Last accessed 2 June, 2010
9. Messina J. Lawyer ? layman: a recipe for disaster! Why the ban on MDP should remain. Univ Pittsbg Law Rev 2000; 62:367-372.
10. Morrison R. Market realities of rule-based software for lawyers: where the rubber meets the road. In: Proceedings of the 6th international conference on artificial intelligence and the law. ACM Press, New York, 1989, 33-36.
11. Oriola T. Regulating unsolicited commercial electronic mails in the United States and the European Union: challenges and prospects. Tulane J Technol Intellect Prop. 2005; 7:134-135.
12. Oskamp A, Lauritsen M. AI in law practice? So far, not much. Artif Intell Law 10:227–236 Palomar J (1991) The war between attorneys and lay-conveyancers: empirical evidence says cease fire! Conn Law Rev. 2002; 31:423-530
13. Podgers J. Statements of principles: are they on the way out? ABA J. 1980; 66:129
14. Rentz M. Laying down the law: bringing down the legal cartel in real estate settlement services and beyond. Georgia Law Rev. 2005; 40:293-333.
15. Rhode D. Policing the professional monopoly: a constitutional and empirical analysis of unauthorized practice prohibitions. Stanford Law Rev. 1981; 34:1-99
16. Rose J. Unauthorized practice of law in Arizona: a legal and political problem that won't go away. Ariz State Law J. 2002; 34:585
17. Schwab S. Bringing down the bar: accountants challenge meaning of unauthorized practice of law. Cardozo Law Rev. 2000; 21:1425-1468.

18. Susskind R. Expert systems in law: a jurisprudential inquiry. Oxford University Press, Oxford, p 3 Susskind R (1996) The future of law: facing the challenges of information technology. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987, 86-87.
19. Susskind R. Transforming the law: essays on technology justice and the legal market place. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000, 162-176.
20. Treece T. The law as a foreign language. South Tex Law Rev. 1999; 40:972
21. Trujillo E. State action antitrust exemption collides with regulation: rehabilitating the foreseeability doctrine. Fordham J Corp Financ Law. 2006; 11:349-352
22. Vida M. Legality of will-creating software: is the sale of computer software to assist in drafting will documents considered the unauthorized practice of law? Santa Clara Law Rev. 2000-2001; 41:231-235.
23. Vincenti R. Self-help legal software and the unauthorized practice of law. Comput Law J. 1988; 185:185-20.