



PROFESSIONAL COUNSEL[®]

Advice and Insight into the Practice of Law[®]

The Fully Remote Law Firm: Ethical Opportunities, Practical Risks & Professional Responsibility in a Virtual Legal Landscape

With the assistance of emerging technology and the lasting influence of the COVID 19 pandemic, the legal profession has undergone a fundamental shift in how and where lawyers practice. Once tethered to brick and mortar offices, physical files, and in person meetings, many lawyers learned during the pandemic that effective legal services could be delivered remotely without sacrificing quality or professionalism. As a result, an increasing number of attorneys, particularly solo practitioners, small firms, and emerging practices, are now considering whether to establish entirely remote law firms.

The appeal of a fully remote law office is undeniable. Reduced overhead, geographic flexibility, and improved work life integration are powerful incentives, particularly for lawyers seeking autonomy or attempting to build a practice without the financial burden of commercial office space. Yet, while technology has made remote practice more feasible than ever before, the ethical obligations governing the practice of law have not disappeared. In many respects, those obligations have become more complex.

A fully remote law firm must navigate the same professional responsibilities as a traditional practice, while also confronting new situations related to confidentiality, supervision, multijurisdictional practice, competence, and cybersecurity. Understanding these ethical considerations is essential for lawyers who wish to take advantage of remote practice opportunities without exposing themselves, or their clients, to unnecessary risk.

This article explores the key pros and cons of establishing a fully remote law office, examines how existing rules of professional conduct apply to remote practice, and highlights additional considerations lawyers should evaluate before moving their practices entirely online.

Pros and Cons of Establishing a Fully Remote Law Office Financial & Operational Advantages

One of the most significant advantages of a fully remote law firm is the reduction in overhead costs. Traditional law offices require substantial financial investment, including rent, utilities, office furniture, parking, maintenance, and administrative support. By contrast, remote firms can often operate with minimal fixed expenses, allowing lawyers to allocate resources toward technology, professional development, or client services instead.

Remote practice can also increase flexibility and productivity. Eliminating a daily commute saves time and reduces stress, while the ability to work in a controlled environment may allow lawyers to focus more deeply on substantive legal work. For many practitioners, remote work has led to greater efficiency, improved responsiveness to clients, and better integration of professional and personal responsibilities. When implemented thoughtfully, remote practice can enhance the quality of legal services.

Geographic Flexibility & Its Hidden Risks

Another benefit of a fully remote law firm is geographic freedom. In theory, a lawyer can work from anywhere with a stable internet connection. In practice, however, this flexibility comes with meaningful ethical and professional constraints.

Unauthorized Practice of Law

Lawyers are not licensed to practice law everywhere simply because technology allows them to do so and ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct [“ABA Model Rule”] 5.5(a) prohibits lawyers from practicing law in a jurisdiction in which they are not licensed. Jurisdictional boundaries still matter, and the unauthorized practice of law remains a serious concern.

The rise of remote work has forced regulators to confront difficult questions about what it means to “practice law” in a particular jurisdiction. Is a lawyer practicing law “in” a state simply because they are physically located there, even if their clients and matters are elsewhere? Most jurisdictions have found that the remote practice of law by a lawyer physically located in another jurisdiction is permissible with certain boundaries.¹

But lawyers working remotely may not mislead the public about where they are licensed to practice law. While “teleworking from a private residence is unlikely to result in a violation of ABA Model Rule 5.5 if the attorney only practices the law of the jurisdiction where they are licensed and communicates that limitation to clients... establishing an office or putting a local address on official communications may indicate that the lawyer is holding themselves out as licensed in that jurisdiction.”²

Competence, Technology & the Duty to Adapt

ABA Model Rule 1.1 imposes a duty of competence, which includes not only substantive legal knowledge but also the ability to use relevant technology effectively.³ In the context of a fully remote law firm, technological competence is not optional; rather, it is foundational.

Remote practices often rely heavily on e filing systems, cloud based document storage, secure client portals, video conferencing platforms, and digital billing tools. Lawyers who fail to understand or properly implement these technologies may expose clients to risk and potentially violate ethical obligations creating legal malpractice and/or disciplinary exposures.

Competence may require lawyers to educate themselves, retain knowledgeable staff, or consult with technology professionals. Simply outsourcing technology without understanding its risks and limitations may be insufficient. As technology becomes increasingly integrated into legal practice, ethical competence necessarily includes technological fluency.

Confidentiality & Privacy in a Remote World

ABA Model Rule 1.6(a) requires lawyers to keep confidential all information relating to the representation. Protecting client confidentiality is a cornerstone of the attorney client relationship. For fully remote lawyers, safeguarding confidentiality requires deliberate planning and consistent vigilance.

When working from home or shared spaces, lawyers must ensure that client communications cannot be overheard or observed by others. This may involve using private rooms for client meetings, employing soundproofing measures, or restricting access to workspaces.

Lawyers should also be mindful of visual confidentiality. Screens, notepads, and printed documents should not be visible to unauthorized individuals, particularly in public settings. Screen filters, secure storage, and disciplined work habits can mitigate these risks.⁴

Additionally, even when lawyers are licensed in the relevant jurisdiction, working remotely from unfamiliar locations raises confidentiality issues under ABA Model Rule 1.6(a) and security issues under ABA Model Rule 1.6(c). For example, lawyers accessing client files while traveling must consider whether they are connected to a secure network. Public Wi Fi poses significant cybersecurity risks. Likewise, working in public spaces increases the likelihood that others may overhear privileged conversations or view confidential documents on a laptop or notepad.

There have been documented instances of lawyers facing disciplinary consequences for breaches of confidentiality arising from seemingly innocuous conduct, such as asking hotel staff to print confidential documents or discussing client matters in public areas.⁵ Remote practice demands heightened awareness of surroundings and proactive steps to safeguard client information at all times.

¹ ABA Formal Ethics Op. 495 (2020); In re Fla. Advisory Op. SC20-1220; Illinois Ethics Op. 20-08 (2020); Maine Ethics Op. 189 (2005); *Michigan Ethic Opinion RI-382 (December 2021)*; [13] *New Jersey Professional Ethics Opinion 742 (October 2021)*; N.Y. rule 523.5; N.Y. Cnty. Ethics Op. 754-2020 (2020); Pennsylvania & Philadelphia Bar Assocs. Joint Formal Op. 2021-100 (2021); Utah Ethics Op. 19-03 (2019); *Virginia Legal Ethics Opinion 1896 (January 2022)*; *Wisconsin Formal Ethics Opinion EF-21-02 (January 2021)*; *San Francisco Opinion 2021-1 (August 2021)*; but see Missouri Informal Opinion Number: 2024-03

² ABA/Bloomberg, *Lawyers’ Manual on Professional Conduct*, 21 Qualifications, Admissions, 21:2101 Multijurisdictional Practice.

³ ABA Model Rule 1.1, Comment [8].

⁴ See CNA Article, *Hot Mikes & Live Video: Practice Tips for Remote Appearances*.

⁵ See, for example, *Fourth Dimension Software v. Der Touristik Deutschland GMBH*, 2021 WL 5909235 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2021); others...

Cybersecurity & Data Protection

Cybersecurity is one of the most significant ethical risk areas for remote firms. Lawyers should use encrypted connections, strong and unique passwords, multi factor authentication, and secure networks. Open or public Wi Fi should be avoided whenever possible, particularly when accessing sensitive client information. Remote firms should also have clear policies addressing device security, software updates, data backups, and incident response plans that all staff are aware of and required to follow.

The Continuing Need for a Physical Presence

Despite the digital transformation of the legal profession, most lawyers cannot entirely dispense with a physical address.⁶ Courts, regulatory bodies, and clients typically require a reliable location for service of process, official correspondence, and records. In many jurisdictions, a lawyer's physical address must also align with the states in which the lawyer is licensed to practice.

The absence of a traditional office does not eliminate the need for accessibility or accountability. For fully remote lawyers, this may mean using a home address or establishing a P.O. Box or virtual office arrangement. Importantly, lawyers must ensure that any address used complies with court rules, bar requirements, and ethical obligations, and that they can reliably receive and respond to mail.

While technology has made remote practice more feasible than ever before, the ethical obligations governing the practice of law have not disappeared.

Supervision & Firm Oversight in a Remote Environment

Another potential drawback of a fully remote law firm is the increased difficulty of supervising other lawyers and staff. The ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct make clear that supervisory responsibilities do not disappear simply because a firm operates remotely.

ABA Model Rule 5.1(a) requires lawyers who directly supervise other lawyers to make reasonable efforts to ensure that their reports conform to the jurisdiction's rules of professional conduct. ABA Model Rule 5.1(c) provides that a lawyer may be responsible for another lawyer's violation of the rules if the lawyer orders or ratifies the conduct, or if the lawyer knows of the conduct and fails to take reasonable remedial action.⁷ In a remote firm, maintaining meaningful oversight can be more challenging, but it is no less essential. ABA Model Rule 5.3 addresses these same requirements for nonlawyer assistance.⁸

Effective supervision in a fully remote environment requires intentional systems and consistent communication. Regular video check ins, structured feedback sessions, shared workflows, and the use of online practice management tools can help ensure compliance with ethical obligations.

Conclusion: Remote Does Not Mean Relaxed

The fully remote practice of law offers flexibility, efficiency, and expanded access to talent and clients. But it also demands heightened intentionality. Ethical compliance in a remote environment cannot be passive or assumed; it must be designed, documented, and actively maintained.

Rules governing supervision, jurisdiction, competence, and confidentiality apply fully to remote practice. While the methods of compliance may differ from traditional office models, the standards do not. Lawyers who embrace remote practice must do so with eyes open and recognize that ethical obligations travel with them, wherever they log in.

Remote practice is not an ethical loophole. It is simply another context in which the profession's core duties must be honored, thoughtfully and consistently, in service of clients and the public trust.

⁶ Lawyers should review the rules or laws of their jurisdiction to understand how those jurisdiction address remote practice. For example, New York Judiciary Law § 470 requires nonresident lawyers admitted in New York to maintain a physical office in the state, even if they are practicing New York law remotely. N.Y. Cnty. Ethics Op. 754-2020 (2020).

⁷ ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct 5.1(c).

⁸ See ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct 5.3.

This article was authored for the benefit of CNA by:

Tracy Kepler

Tracy L. Kepler is the Risk Control Director for CNA's Lawyers' Professional Liability program. In this role, she designs and develops content and distribution of risk control initiatives relevant to the practice of law. Prior to joining CNA, Tracy previously served as the Director of the American Bar Association's Center for Professional Responsibility (CPR) and has over 20+ years of experience in attorney regulation through her positions as an Associate Solicitor for the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office and as Senior Litigation Counsel for the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission. She also teaches Legal Ethics and Professional Responsibility at Georgetown University Law Center, American University – Washington College of Law and Loyola University School of Law (Chicago).

Don't Miss Out on Future CNA LPL Publications

If you wish to receive the CNA Lawyers' Professional Liability Risk Control monthly publications, you may register [here](#).

About CNA Professional Counsel

This publication offers advice and insights to help lawyers identify risk exposures associated with their practice. Written exclusively by the members of CNA's Lawyers Professional Liability Risk Control team, it offers details, tips and recommendations on important topics from client misconduct to wire transfer fraud.

For more information, please call us at 866-262-0540 or email us at lawyersrisk@cna.com

The author's opinions are their own and have not necessarily been adopted by their employers. The purpose of this article is to provide information, rather than advice or opinion. The information it contains is accurate to the best of the author's knowledge as of the date it was written, but it does not constitute and cannot substitute for the advice of a retained legal professional. Only your own attorney can provide you with assurances that the information contained herein is applicable or appropriate to your particular situation. Accordingly, you should not rely upon (or act upon, or refrain from acting upon) the material herein without first seeking legal advice from a lawyer admitted to practice in the relevant jurisdiction.

These examples are not those of any actual claim tendered to the CNA companies, and any resemblance to actual persons, insureds, and/or claims is purely accidental. The examples described herein are for illustrative purposes only. They are not intended to constitute a contract, to establish any duties or standards of care, or to acknowledge or imply that any given factual situation would be covered under any CNA insurance policy. Please remember that only the relevant insurance policy can provide the actual terms, coverages, amounts, conditions and exclusions for an insured. All CNA products and services may not be available in all states and may be subject to change without notice. "CNA" is a registered trademark of CNA Financial Corporation. Certain CNA Financial Corporations subsidiaries use the "CNA" trademark in connection with insurance underwriting and claims activities. Copyright © 2026 CNA. All rights reserved. Published 5/26.

