

# New York Court of Appeals Limits Availability of Common Interest Privilege

June 13, 2016 | Client Update

On June 9, 2016, New York's highest court issued an important decision on the "common interest doctrine," limiting the circumstances in which parties with common legal interests may share information protected by the attorney-client privilege without waiving the privilege. In a 4-2 decision in *Ambac Assurance Corp. v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, the New York Court of Appeals reversed a 2014 ruling by the Appellate Division, First Department, and held that the common interest doctrine applies to communications between parties that share a common legal interest *only if* those communications relate to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation. The Court of Appeals' opinion, which departs from the approach taken in Delaware, Massachusetts, and many federal courts, will have implications for parties' exchange of documents and other information in a range of transactional, regulatory and other non-litigation contexts.

If you have any questions regarding the matters covered in this publication, please reach out to any of the lawyers listed below or your usual Davis Polk contact.

**Charles S. Duggan**

+1 212 450 4785  
charles.duggan@davispolk.com

**Michael S. Flynn**

+1 212 450 4766  
michael.flynn@davispolk.com

**Antonio J. Perez-Marques**

+1 212 450 4559  
antonio.perez@davispolk.com

**Edmund Polubinski**

+1 212 450 4695  
edmund.polubinski@davispolk.com

**Lawrence Portnoy**

+1 212 450 4874  
lawrence.portnoy@davispolk.com

**Neal Potischman**

+1 650 752 2021  
neal.potischman@davispolk.com

**Lindsay Schare**

+1 212 450 3279  
lindsay.schare@davispolk.com

**Amelia T.R. Starr**

+1 212 450 4516  
amelia.starr@davispolk.com

**James H.R. Windels**

+1 212 450 4978  
james.windels@davispolk.com

*This communication, which we believe may be of interest to our clients and friends of the firm, is for general information only. It is not a full analysis of the matters presented and should not be relied upon as legal advice. This may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Please refer to the firm's privacy notice for further details.*

## Related materials

[Read the full update](#)