

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **Utah Supreme Court's Ad Hoc Committee on Regulatory Reform**

#### **Legal Tech/AI and Rule 5.4 Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, July 18, 2025**

**12:00 – 1:00**

**Hybrid and In-person**

Attendance Online: Wesley Harward, Kent Davis, Jurhee Rice, Nick Hafen, David Wingate,

Attendance In-Person: Maryt Fredrickson, Nick Stiles, Andrea Donahue, Marybeth LeHoux, Alexander Chang, Beth Kennedy

---

Maryt welcomed everyone and briefly discussed what talked about last time.

Approval of previous meeting minutes. No corrections or nay votes.

Two big discussion topics:

1. Gathering viewpoints from different perspectives (such as self help center or people in the Sandbox or others). Asked who do we want to hear from and what do we want to hear from them.
  - a. Education in the kinds of biases that different AI models have demonstrated, specifically against people and women of color. As we continue to move forward, will need to keep that in mind. Wants to hear from experts about how the biases have been observed and how those biases can be manipulated.
  - b. Entities from the Sandbox who work especially with legal tech. Recommended to talk with those entities and see what they could do if the rules were changed.
  - c. Talk with access to justice folks and see why those individuals have not accessed AI tools or legal tech resources. Self-Help center is using some AI tools to assist.
  - d. Value in hearing negative viewpoints about Sandbox and AI and their best arguments about why these efforts should not continue. There was early pushback from UAJ (personal injury attorneys) when opening the Sandbox and curious if there are still some outspoken folks who would be interested. Allison McCallister would be a good person to talk about to get this.

## 2. Scope of recommendations and/or priorities

- a. The scope is not lawyers using AI to do their work but rather nonlawyers using AI to do legal work.
- b. Discussion of recourse if consumers injured by entities performing legal services. Arizona requires compliance attorneys. Discussion of whether those companies are, or can, require liability waivers as a condition of service.
- c. Discussion of large platforms, like Google, providing legal advice with no recourse for consumers or liability for giving wrong advice. Further discussion on how AI will grow, will reduce hallucinations, and largest volume of consumers will use the free models. Discussion of distinction between large generalist AI, like Google that is analogous to a law book at a library, and companies that charge a fee for legal advice and service targeted to that consumer.
- d. Discussion of definition of legal advice and unauthorized practice of law. Possible to approach as finding recourse for injured consumers and accountability without addressing that line drawing of UPL.
- e. Discussion of how attorney-client privilege rules play in to AI and legal tech, which could result in recommending some rule changes.
- f. Request to follow up with Dean Perlman on the examples he provided at previous meeting.

Closing remarks: the two working groups will remain together for now, at least for one more meeting. Next meeting will be access to justice day. We can send questions in advance to the speakers so they know what to prepare for. A request for case studies may help crystalize some thinking.