

Meeting Minutes
Utah Supreme Court's Ad Hoc Committee on Regulatory Reform
AI/Legal Tech Meeting Minutes
May 15, 2026
12:00 – 1:00
Virtual & In-person

The group approved the minutes from the previous meeting.

- Wes Howard has switched jobs and is not able to continue with the Committee. The group appreciates his contributions and wishes him well on next adventures.
- The Committee heard from three guest speakers: Lucian Pera (Tennessee/national perspective), Sateesh Nori (New York legal services/access to justice), and Jessica Yates (head of the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel, Colorado Supreme Court).
- Lucian surveyed the national UPL landscape, including reform efforts underway in Tennessee and New York. Lucian shared his recent ABA article and a New York City Bar draft report, both proposing a narrow, disclosure-based safe harbor for AI legal tools modeled on a Texas statute as a way to resolve the UPL uncertainty that currently chills innovation.
- UPL uncertainty was the central theme across all three presentations. Speakers agreed that the lack of clarity around what constitutes UPL discourages the development of tools that could meaningfully expand access to justice. There was some discussion of other consumer protection vehicles, via malpractice actions or products liability. The *Nippon* case was discussed.
- Sateesh presented two tools his organization has developed: Roxanne AI (housing conditions) and Depositron (security deposit recovery). Both face potential shutdown under proposed New York legislation restricting AI-generated professional advice, e.g., chatbots giving advice.
- Jessica presented Colorado's non-prosecution policy as an alternative to a formal UPL definitional amendment. The working group started by looking at a carve out from the UPL rules and shifted to a non-prosecution policy instead, for a three year period. The policy identifies criteria (e.g., confidentiality disclosures, avoiding a representative capacity, and taking reasonable steps to minimize erroneous output) under which Colorado will decline to prosecute platforms for

UPL. Colorado appears to be the only state with a public-facing policy of this kind. Texas created a carve out by legislation. WA, AZ, and MN have explored this in various ways.

- On opposition, speakers identified two primary categories: attorneys concerned about practice disruption, and broader concerns about harm to vulnerable populations, particularly children.
- On consumer protection, Lucian flagged that many AI tools' broad liability waivers may run afoul of existing state consumer protection laws and encouraged the group to examine whether those waivers are enforceable. Lucian also discussed the role of 5.4 and the opportunities to remove 5.4. There has been recent scholarship on the protectionist roots of 5.4, particularly in a law review article noting the role of Auto Clubs provided legal services prior to 5.4.