## Attorney-Client Confidentiality

$\checkmark$ Like anyone who retains an attorney's services, those accused of crimes are afforded confidentiality for communications with their attorney; ${ }^{1}$
$\checkmark$ The right to counsel under the $6^{\text {th }}$ Amendment requires confidentiality; ${ }^{2}$
$\checkmark$ Encourages "full and frank communications" for preparing a case; ${ }^{3}$
$\checkmark$ Extends to communications with all professionals assisting with a client's case. ${ }^{4}$

## Right to Confidentiality Extends to a Client's Defense Team

## Problem:

- Professionals, such as investigators or psychologists, employed by lawyers to assist in a client's case are often provided less confidentiality protections because they are not attorneys, despite (1) being an essential function of a client's defense and (2) the fact that the law already requires it.


## HB 3249 is the Solution:

$\checkmark$ Codifies and clarifies the right to confer privately and confidentially with one's lawyer as a right that extends to the lawyer's defense team; and
$\checkmark$ Provides legal backbone to confidential communications by prohibiting evidence obtained in violation of confidentiality as inadmissible against a client in court.

## Product of Stakeholder Discussion with Unanimous Passage

- Pre-session \& workgroup discussion with law enforcement \& other stakeholders ${ }^{5}$
- Passed out of House Judiciary Committee Unanimously with Bi-partisan support

Passed off House Floor with Unanimous Support

## OCDLA Encourages your "aye" vote!
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