

Key obligations, practice triggers, and red flags for parental alienation matters.

RULE	THE OBLIGATION	IN A PA CASE — BEFORE YOU ACT	RED FLAG
<b>Rule 1.1 Competence</b>	Provide legally and factually competent representation. Know the science, the case law, and your expert's methodology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Read at least one peer-reviewed source on PA before filing or arguing alienation</li> <li>● Review Baker's Four-Factor Model and be able to articulate it</li> <li>● Vet any expert for Daubert/Kumho reliability before retention</li> <li>● Know what Oklahoma courts have accepted as persuasive PA evidence</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>You cannot define the Four-Factor Model or explain the difference between alienation and estrangement.</p>
<b>Rule 1.3 Diligence</b>	Act with reasonable diligence and promptness. Document, file, and follow up — but don't escalate without basis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Document alienating conduct with dates, specifics, and supporting records</li> <li>● File parenting plan enforcement motions promptly</li> <li>● Pursue contempt when orders are repeatedly violated</li> <li>● Counsel client: unnecessary escalation harms children and their case</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>Client's hostility — not the facts — is driving your filing decisions.</p>
<b>Rule 3.1 Meritorious Claims</b>	Do not assert alienation unless there is a non-frivolous basis in law and fact — documented, repeated conduct, not one-off incidents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Is the conduct documented and repeated — not isolated?</li> <li>● Can you distinguish alienating behavior from a child's legitimate preference?</li> <li>● Have you screened for DV? PA and DV frequently co-occur</li> <li>● Do you have or need expert support to satisfy the factual threshold?</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>The alienation claim is based on the client's characterization alone, with no corroborating evidence.</p>

Rules governing candor, fairness, and courtroom conduct in parental alienation matters.

RULE	THE OBLIGATION	IN A PA CASE — BEFORE YOU ACT	RED FLAG
<b>Rule 3.3 Candor Tribunal</b>	Do not knowingly make false statements of fact or law to the tribunal. Correct false statements previously made — even if privileged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Client denies alienating conduct you have evidence of → cannot present as unqualified fact</li> <li>● Expert conclusions outrun the evidence → disclosure obligation before presenting</li> <li>● Child's stated preference appears coached → cannot present as spontaneous</li> <li>● If client refuses correction, consider withdrawal under Rule 1.16</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>You know a statement or exhibit is false or misleading and plan to use it anyway.</p>
<b>Rule 3.4 Fairness to Opposing Party</b>	Do not obstruct access to evidence. Do not alter, destroy, or conceal documents with potential evidentiary value.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Produce therapy, school, and communication records fully and timely</li> <li>● Advise client on accurate (not strategic) documentation of incidents</li> <li>● Witness prep must stop at accurate recollection — not characterization coaching</li> <li>● Do not create obstacles to GAL's independent investigation</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>You've advised the client what NOT to write — rather than what to document accurately.</p>
<b>Rule 3.5 +OBA Standards</b>	No ex parte communication. No conduct intended to disrupt the tribunal. Maintain dignity and civility as a matter of professional identity — not just compliance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 3.5(a): Do not seek to influence a judge by means prohibited by law</li> <li>● 3.5(b): No ex parte contact during the proceeding without court authorization</li> <li>● 3.5(d): No conduct intended to disrupt the tribunal</li> <li>● OBA: 'Ill feelings between clients shall not dictate your attitude or demeanor'</li> </ul>	<p>■ <b>RED FLAG</b></p> <p>Your filings or courtroom conduct are designed to inflame rather than persuade.</p>

### HOW THESE RULES INTERACT IN PA CASES

Rules 1.1 + 3.1 work together: competence (knowing the science) is what allows you to evaluate merit. Rules 3.1 + 3.3 overlap: a claim lacking factual basis is also likely to require misleading the tribunal to advance. Rules 3.4 + 3.3 intersect: evidence coaching creates false impressions the attorney then presents to the court. Rule 1.3 runs through all of them: diligence means pursuing legitimate claims vigorously while actively screening for ethical limits.