

Highlights Law of Lawyer Advertising 2026-2027

- The South Carolina Supreme Court addressed multi-state practice issues, issuing a public reprimand to a law firm headquartered in Georgia for its cross-border advertising in South Carolina.
- The distinction between commercial and non-commercial speech played prominently in a federal district court decision in Connecticut, holding that a lawyer who commissioned a graphics company to create an animation showing how a P320 pistol could misfire absent a trigger pull, and then posted the animation to YouTube and published the video on his firm's website, was engaged commercial advertising or promotion within the ambit of the Lanham Act, because it was commercial speech made for the purpose of influencing potential clients.
- The Supreme Court of Ohio issued a two-year conditional suspension of a lawyer who continued to advertise as the member of a "legal group" even though he was a sole practitioner. Although at one point an associate worked with the lawyer, the phrase "legal group" continued on the lawyer's advertising for more than a year after that associate left the practice.
- The Supreme Court of Ohio found that a lawyer violated Ohio Rule of Professional Conduct 7.2(b) when a solo practitioner paid out-of-state solicitation networks for personal-injury referrals.