

Text of Email sent to www.cpexposed.com The sender identifies a surprising cluster of common purpose terms in one text. Surprisingly a common purpose at law is unlawful.

This is for solicitors 2007 Brian,
these are the paras which contain the phrase common purpose which seems to take precedence...is this their secret language and the reason that solicitors all seem to work together on first name terms, and collude behind the backs of family court victims?

<http://www.sra.org.uk/documents/code/rule-3-conflict-of-interests.pdf>

Any areas of conflict must be substantially less important to all the clients than their **common purpose** and may, for example, relate to slightly different views on how the **common purpose** is to be achieved. It will be your duty to keep the differences under review with the clients and to decide if the point has been reached when it would be untenable to continue to represent all of them in a fair and open manner or without any of them being prejudiced.

(iv) There exist some multi-party complex commercial transactions, **where sophisticated users of legal services, who have a common purpose**, may expect a firm to act for two or more parties, because this will facilitate efficient handling of the matter (taking into account amongst other things the desire to complete the transaction quickly, the availability of necessary experience/expertise and the overall costs). Indeed in many cases it may already be accepted business practice for firms to act in this manner. An example is acting for different tiers of lenders (for example senior lenders and mezzanine lenders) and/or different parties (for example arrangers/underwriters and bond/security

trustees) in entering into a financing transaction where there is already an agreed or commonly understood structure with regard to the ranking of their respective claims, the content of their respective obligations and associated commercial issues.

(v) While accepted business practice can be considered as a factor in determining whether an appropriate **common purpose exists**, you and your firm should always exercise caution when proposing to act in accordance with 3.02 and should be mindful of the residual test of reasonableness referred to in 3.02(3).