

**2003 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS**  
**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE**

**Hon. Barbara Kerr Howe**  
CHAIR  
Towson, MD

**Hon. Shirley S. Abrahamson**  
Madison, WI

**Betty Smith Adams**  
Columbia, MD

**David S. Baker**  
Atlanta, GA

**Anthony L. Butler**  
Seattle, WA

**Gerald M. Eisenstat**  
Vineland, NJ

**Hon. Larry Ramirez**  
Las Cruces, NM

**Arnold Rosenfeld**  
Boston, MA

**William P. Smith, III**  
Atlanta, GA

**Liaisons**  
**Board of Governors**  
**Harry S. Hardin, III**  
New Orleans, LA

**National Organization of Bar Counsel**  
**G. Fred Ours**  
Baton Rouge, LA

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION**  
**CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**

**Jeanne P. Gray, DIRECTOR**

**Mary M. Devlin, REGULATION COUNSEL**

**Ellyn S. Rosen, ASSOCIATE REGULATION COUNSEL**

**Susan E. Dianovsky, REGULATION PARALEGAL**

# **2003 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)**

## **Introduction to 2003 S.O.L.D. Survey Results**

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2003 was sent to 55 lawyer disciplinary agencies. All 55 agencies responded to the questionnaire. Medians and averages of various categories are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2003 Survey consists of eight charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with footnotes if clarification of data is necessary. In some instances exact figures were not available. Therefore, approximate figures were provided. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data was not available or applicable. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the ABA by the various jurisdictions. Please contact the specific jurisdiction if you have further inquiries. Contact information for lawyer disciplinary agencies is at <http://www.abanet.org/cpr/regulation/scpd/disciplinary.html>. Numerous resources for research and statistics about lawyers and the legal profession are readily available at [ABA Market Research Department \(MRD\)](#).

## **2003 S.O.L.D. Survey Results**

The following jurisdictions indicated they have fiscal years rather than calendar years: Alabama, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th District, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Questions regarding the Survey should be addressed to Ellyn S. Rosen, Senior Counsel, at the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility. You can contact her at [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org).

Chart I	Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume
Chart II	Sanctions Imposed
Chart III	Reinstatement and Readmission Statistics
Chart IV	Disciplinary Agency Caseload Statistics
Chart V	Case Processing Times
Chart VI	Budget Information and Sources of Funding
Chart VII	Allocation of Dues and Fees in State Disciplinary Systems
Chart VIII	Staffing of Disciplinary Agencies

# **2003 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)**

## **Introduction to 2003 S.O.L.D. Survey Results**

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2003 was sent to 55 lawyer disciplinary agencies. All 55 agencies responded to the questionnaire. Medians and averages of various categories are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2003 Survey consists of eight charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with footnotes if clarification of data is necessary. In some instances exact figures were not available. Therefore, approximate figures were provided. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data was not available or applicable. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the ABA by the various jurisdictions. Please contact the specific jurisdiction if you have further inquiries. Contact information for lawyer disciplinary agencies is at <http://www.abanet.org/cpr/regulation/scpd/disciplinary.html>. Numerous resources for research and statistics about lawyers and the legal profession are readily available at [ABA Market Research Department \(MRD\)](#).

## **2003 S.O.L.D. Survey Results**

The following jurisdictions indicated they have fiscal years rather than calendar years: Alabama, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th District, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Questions regarding the Survey should be addressed to Ellyn S. Rosen, Senior Counsel, at the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility. You can contact her at [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org).

- Chart I      Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume
- Chart II     Sanctions Imposed
- Chart III    Reinstatement and Readmission Statistics
- Chart IV    Disciplinary Agency Caseload Statistics
- Chart V     Case Processing Times
- Chart VI    Budget Information and Sources of Funding
- Chart VII   Allocation of Dues and Fees in State Disciplinary Systems
- Chart VIII  Staffing of Disciplinary Agencies

**American Bar Association**

**Center for Professional Responsibility**

**SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS**

**2003 DATA**

Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Reporting: \_\_\_\_\_ Tel.# \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Person Reporting: \_\_\_\_\_

**INTRODUCTION**

The American Bar Association's Center for Professional Responsibility is the only organization that collects, analyzes and compiles statistics about lawyer regulatory systems on a national basis. This data, which is published in the ABA Survey on Lawyer Disciplinary Systems (S.O.L.D.), serves to educate the public, the profession, the news media and disciplinary agencies about enforcement, caseload and budgetary activity in each jurisdiction. Information from the Surveys has been used by disciplinary agencies to effect changes in caseload management, staffing and funding of their lawyer disciplinary systems. As a result, it is essential that the Center maintain accurate data with respect to each jurisdiction. **Your cooperation in helping us collect this data is vital, and your timely responses are appreciated.**

The Survey questionnaire is intended to be as brief as possible, while still allowing us to gather essential, accurate and complete information. We continue our efforts to make the Survey more “user friendly” given the diversity of lawyer disciplinary systems and terminology utilized by the various agencies. Any suggestions for future modifications that would increase the usefulness of the Survey are welcome and appreciated. Thank you again for your continued participation.



## **TERMS AND PHRASES**

The following explanation of terms and phrases used in the Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems is provided to assist in the collection of data.

### **Complaint:**

Any information received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct that requires a determination as to whether the disciplinary agency has jurisdiction over the lawyer or matter(s) complained of, or whether sufficient facts are alleged that would, if true, constitute misconduct. These complaints are sometimes called “grievances” or “requests for the investigation of a lawyer.” These complaints may be in the form of a written submission, e-mail submission, an in-person discussion whose contents are reduced to writing, or other information received by the disciplinary agency, including written, audio or visual media reports, records of criminal convictions, etc.

### **Disbarment on Consent:**

A form of discipline on consent whereby a lawyer against whom formal charges are pending tenders a conditional admission to the allegations of misconduct, agrees that the appropriate sanction for that misconduct is disbarment and requests that the appropriate authority, typically the highest court, impose that sanction. In some jurisdictions, disbarment on consent is referred to as resignation with charges pending. In other jurisdictions, a resignation, with or without charges pending, means that a lawyer who is retired, or no longer engaged in the practice of law in that jurisdiction asks to assume inactive status. The latter form of resignation does not constitute a disciplinary sanction for purposes of this Survey and should not be reported to us.

### **Formal Charges:**

Any document, pleading or notice filed by the disciplinary agency, or appropriate authority, before the designated adjudicatory tribunal, wherein a lawyer is charged with specified acts of misconduct and a disciplinary sanction is sought.

### **Investigation:**

Any inquiry into allegations of misconduct contained in the initial complaint to the disciplinary agency, including, but not limited to, asking the lawyer who is the subject of the complaint to respond to the allegations, interviewing witnesses and/or obtaining documentary evidence concerning the allegations.

### **Misconduct:**

A violation of the applicable rules of professional conduct.

### **Private/Non-Public Sanction:**

Any disciplinary sanction where the identity of the lawyer sanctioned is kept confidential. Such private sanctions may include censure, admonition or reprimand. In cases where a lawyer receives a private sanction, a description of the conduct for which that lawyer has been disciplined, without disclosing the name of the lawyer, may still be published for the education of the profession and the public. For purposes of this Survey, if such publication occurs the sanction is still considered private/non-public.

### **Screened Out/Summarily Dismissed Without Investigation:**

The disposal of a complaint by the disciplinary agency without seeking any information in addition to that which is contained in the initial complaint to the agency, whether or not that complaint is accorded file status or is docketed.

**PART II. CASE PROCESSING AND SANCTION STATISTICS**

Please fill in the appropriate figures for calendar year 2003 or for your fiscal year ending in the month of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003. Where a question asks for an average, such as in Part III, Sections A. & C., please provide that number for the calendar or fiscal year that you use. Some questions will ask for data relating to other years. If you have any concerns regarding how to respond to a particular question, please call Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel, at (312) 988-5311.

If your jurisdiction does not maintain the type of data or engage in the type of activity requested, please answer with the designation N/A. Please provide explanations of your responses where necessary.

**A. LAWYER POPULATION**

1. Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with active licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the **2003** calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS**

2. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct during the **2003** calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency prior to the commencement of the **2003** calendar/fiscal year that were still pending on the first day of that calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Total number of complaints that were screened out or dismissed without investigation during the **2003** calendar/fiscal year for lack of jurisdiction, or for not alleging sufficient facts that would, if true, constitute misconduct. (This number may include complaints that were received prior to the commencement of the **2003** calendar/fiscal year.):

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the **2003** calendar/fiscal year (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the **2003** calendar/fiscal year, as well as complaints received during that year):

---

6. Of the total number of complaints reported in response to question 5, how many were closed or dismissed by the disciplinary agency during the **2003** calendar/fiscal year after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant formal charges.

---

7. In how many of the complaints reported in response to question 5, was there a determination by the appropriate authority, in calendar/fiscal year **2003** that formal charges of misconduct should be brought/initiated:

---

8. Total number of lawyers against whom formal charges were brought/initiated in calendar/fiscal year **2003**:

---

**C. SANCTIONS**

9. Total number of lawyers who received private, i.e., non-public, disciplinary sanctions during calendar/fiscal year **2003**:

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year **2003**:

\_\_\_\_\_

11. Of these total public sanctions,

a. Total involuntary/adjudicated disbarments: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Total disbarments on consent (including resignations as defined in the Terms & Phrases): \_\_\_\_\_

c. Total suspensions: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Total interim suspensions (for risk of harm or for criminal conviction): \_\_\_\_\_

e. Total public reprimands/censures: \_\_\_\_\_

f. Total probations (including probation imposed with other sanctions): \_\_\_\_\_

g. Total transfers to disability-inactive status: \_\_\_\_\_

**D. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION**

12. Total number of petitions, motions and requests for reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law filed during calendar/fiscal year **2003**: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Of these, the number granted after imposition of the following sanction:

a. Disbarment (involuntary, adjudicated disbarment and disbarment on consent as defined in the Terms & Phrases): \_\_\_\_\_

b. Suspension: \_\_\_\_\_

14. Total number of petitions, motions or requests for reinstatement/readmission denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during calendar/fiscal year **2003**:

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART III. CASE LOAD**

**A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**

15. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year 2003? (Caseload means the number of investigations and formal charges).

\_\_\_\_\_

16. What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into calendar/fiscal year **2003** from previous years?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2003**?

\_\_\_\_\_

18. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year **2003**?

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. TIME GUIDELINES**

19. In response to the **2003** survey, the following jurisdictions indicated that they have formally adopted time guidelines for case processing: AK, CA, HI, LA, ME, MD, MA, MS, NE, NV, OH, OR, PA, SC, TN, VA, WA and WI. If your jurisdiction has adopted such formal time guidelines, indicate so below, and provide a brief description or a copy of them:

---

---

---

20. If your jurisdiction does not have formally adopted time guidelines, does your jurisdiction have unofficial or aspirational time guidelines?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

(If yes, and they are new or have changed since **2002**, please include a copy or indicate below what they are.)

---

---

---

**C. CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

21. What is the average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to summary dismissal/screening without investigation, as described in Section II, B -- Case Processing Statistics of this Survey?

\_\_\_\_\_

22. What is the average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to closure or dismissal if no formal charges are filed?

\_\_\_\_\_

23. What is the average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to the filing of formal charges?

\_\_\_\_\_

24. What is the average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to the imposition of:

Private/non-public sanction: \_\_\_\_\_

Public sanction: \_\_\_\_\_

25. What is the average time to process a petition, motion or request for reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law, from the time the petition, motion or request is filed to final disposition?

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART VI. FEES, DUES, AND BUDGET**

**A. 2003 BUDGET**

26. Total budget for the lawyer discipline system in the **2003** calendar/fiscal year: \$\_\_\_\_\_

27. Total budget for disciplinary counsel's office: \$\_\_\_\_\_

28. This amount includes:

a. Salaries and benefits:                      Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

b. Space:    Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

c. Equipment and Supplies:                      Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

d. Travel/Education/Training:                      Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

29. Total budget for disciplinary board administration: \$\_\_\_\_\_

30. Please indicate the percentage of funding from each source:

a. Bar association earmarked dues: \_\_\_\_\_ %

b. Supreme Court assessed fees: \_\_\_\_\_ %

c. Supreme Court general budget: \_\_\_\_\_ %

d. Legislative appropriation: \_\_\_\_\_ %

e. Other: (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**B. FEES & DUES**

31. Please respond to the following for calendar year **2003** or for your fiscal year ending in the month of \_\_\_\_\_, **2003**.

32. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law: \$\_\_\_\_\_.

If there is a scale related to years of practice, please include from lowest to highest:

\_\_\_\_\_ (years in practice)      \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**PART V. STAFFING OF THE DISCIPLINARY AGENCY**

**Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for 2003 in each category, e.g., when two individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal one full-time equivalent. Decimals may be used, e.g., when three individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal 1.5 full-time equivalents. Please report paid staff only.**

	<u>Full Time</u>	<u>Part Time</u>
1. Chief Disciplinary Counsel:	_____	_____
2. Other Disciplinary Counsel:	_____	_____
3. Other lawyers on staff:	_____	_____
4. Investigators:	_____	_____
5. Legal assistants/paralegals:	_____	_____
6. Secretarial/clerical/administrative personnel:	_____	_____
7. Law students/clerks:	_____	_____
8. Auditors:	_____	_____
9. Probation monitors:	_____	_____
10. Other staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)	_____	_____
11. <b>TOTAL</b> number of paid disciplinary agency staff: (should be the sum of 1 through 10)	_____	_____
12. What is the percentage of nonlawyer members on hearing bodies in your agency?	_____	_____

In order for the Center to maintain accurate information for each jurisdiction in the Directory of Lawyer Disciplinary Agencies, please complete the following information for the Chief Disciplinary Counsel and the Disciplinary Board Chair:

Name of Chief Disciplinary Counsel: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Website (if available): \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Disciplinary Board Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO:**

**(Before May 12, 2004)**

Susan E. Dianovsky  
American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
541 North Fairbanks Court, 14th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60611-3314  
PH: 312/988-6223\*  
FAX: 312/988-5491 or 312/988-5280  
E-Mail: [sdianovsky@staff.abanet.org](mailto:sdianovsky@staff.abanet.org)

**(After May 12, 2004)**

Susan E. Dianovsky  
American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
**321 North Clark Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor**  
**Chicago, Illinois 60610**  
PH: 312/988-6223\*  
FAX: 312/988-5491 or 312/988-5280  
E-Mail: [sdianovsky@staff.abanet.org](mailto:sdianovsky@staff.abanet.org)

\*Call for an e-mail version of the survey if you prefer.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</u>
Alabama	14,101	1,589	92	1,174	274	186	50	50
Alaska	2,694	214	106	189	47	25	22	5
Arizona	12,930	2,306	N/A	1,205	1,718	910	226	64
Arkansas	8,500	1,082	1,000	825	700	438	181	181
California	145,713	13,522	3,326	10,610	5,277	1,860	1,583	547
Colorado	20,647	4,521	61	4,032	602	264	133	61
Connecticut	31,560	1,358	N/A	197	989	859	130	N/A
Delaware	2,987	504	50	212	342	281	61	40
District of Columbia	56,140	1,333	392	692	869	372	57	57
Florida	65,894	8,671	3,524	1,143	9,144	6,803	900	N/A
Georgia	34,561	2,712	426	2,256	261	241	192	170
Hawaii	4,308	655	621	234	1,002	358	18	11
Idaho	3,447	397	160	273	117	25	19	19
Illinois	76,671	6,325	2,079	1,396	7,008	4,403	416	184
Indiana	14,918	1,545	841	892	1,494	615	78	37
Iowa	8,031	472	132	12	503	374	129	41
Kansas	9,740	954	N/A	367	571 <sup>1</sup>	493 <sup>2</sup>	116 <sup>3</sup>	N/A

<sup>1</sup>Kansas: Docketed Complaints opened plus Non-Docketed Complaints opened for attorney response.

<sup>2</sup>Kansas: Non-Docketed Complaints closed after attorney response plus Docketed Complaints closed by dismissal.

<sup>3</sup>Kansas: Docketed Complaints closed by imposition of discipline.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</u>
<u>STATE</u>								
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	74,863	3,495	1,431	1,221	3,778	2,160	53	28
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Dist.	12,917	2,735	561	1,258	1,363	447	29	29
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Dist.	12,467	1,672	692	433	704	653	51	31
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	18,672	2,979	880	939	3,902	574	51	40
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	8,951	1,718	1,542	1,032	715	394	180	143
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	12,000	2,202	583	837	2,882	1,107	122	53
North Carolina	19,745	1,901	N/A	1,871	N/A	N/A	88	26
North Dakota	1,840	199	87	64	187	150	37	N/A
Ohio	38,438	6,595 <sup>6</sup>	415 <sup>7</sup>	4,327 <sup>6</sup>	2,268 <sup>6</sup>	1,004 <sup>7</sup>	46 <sup>7</sup>	118 <sup>6</sup>
Oklahoma	15,062	1,575	175	1,122	628	411	41	16
Oregon	12,250	1,542	N/A	800	740	600	102	N/A

<sup>6</sup>Ohio: Combined Office of Disciplinary Counsel and Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline.

<sup>7</sup>Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel only.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</u>
Kentucky	14,294	953	445	331	1,551	354	63	38
Louisiana	19,337	2,847	3,133	1,189	4,788	1,393	241	107
Maine	4,300	315	62	54	323	237	23	19
Maryland	31,224	2,034	337	1,559	2,034	1,559	102	67
Massachusetts	46,850	1,198	1,285	75	2,483	925	214	148
Michigan	35,224	3,583	N/A	2,696	N/A	692	241	141
Minnesota	24,163	1,168	462	496	1,135	405	N/A	20
Mississippi	9,235	537	N/A	N/A	32	7	25	35
Missouri	26,883	2,529	610	1,463	1,676	574	134	40
Montana	2,600	320	89	41	296	192	33	12
Nebraska	5,983	525	N/A	141	384	306	89	46
Nevada	5,986	1,257	N/A	100 <sup>4</sup>	1,157 <sup>5</sup>	1,079	27	N/A
New Hampshire	4,066	191	N/A	83	252	116	52	28
New Jersey	57,583	6,800	1,314	5,097	3,017	1,368	196	N/A
New Mexico	5,706	597	129	456	555	455	32	14

<sup>4</sup>Nevada: Less than 100 cases dismissed by Bar Counsel with no review and without a grievance file being opened.

<sup>5</sup>Nevada: 945 complaints investigated without a grievance file opened plus 212 grievance files opened.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</u>
Pennsylvania	55,360	5,013	883	1,055	4,841	3,287	N/A	110
Rhode Island	4,631	442	N/A	112	330	263	3	3
South Carolina	8,931	1,233	766	200	1,799	1,143	22	22
South Dakota	2,000	112	5	20	92	80	7	7
Tennessee	16,488	1,507	N/A	336	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Texas	73,951	7,518	N/A	4,987	2,609	1,771	N/A	N/A
Utah	6,273	1,038	727	822	943	230	82	54
Vermont	2,500	285	94	73	379	170	25	21
Virginia	24,197	3,935	1,139	2,746	2,328	510	287	N/A
Washington	24,380	2,718	382	923	2,721	2,556	165	91
West Virginia	5,480	619	461	192	1,080	506	34	10
Wisconsin	21,112	2,261	1,313	1,758	1,816	183	104	46
Wyoming	1,953	150	25	50	79	22	0*	0
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,280,737</b>	<b>119,863</b>	<b>32,422</b>	<b>62,241</b>	<b>82,789</b>	<b>44,893</b>	<b>7,150</b>	<b>2,912</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>22,870</b>	<b>2,179</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>1,656</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>13,516</b>	<b>1,507</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>40</b>

\*Some jurisdictions supplied partial data.

\*Wyoming: All matters resolved by stipulation prior to filing formal charges.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Private Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Public Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments on Consent</u>	<u>No. of Suspensions</u>	<u>No. of Interim Suspensions (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>No. of Public Reprimands/ Censures</u>	<u>No. of Probations</u>	<u>No. of Transfers to Disability Inactive Status</u>
Alabama	50	38	7	0	9	1	19	2	2 <sup>1</sup>
Alaska	0	5	1	0	1	0	3	0	1
Arizona	N/A	216	7	0	37	7	27	100	6
Arkansas	54	107	0	5	20	9	65	1	0
California	66	390	66	81	279	218	61	277	9
Colorado	9	75	21	N/A	50	13	4	25	11
Connecticut	N/A	94	3	6	10 <sup>2</sup>	5	50	N/A	0
Delaware	9	13	1	1	3	3	5	5	0
District of Columbia	0	51	20	8	17	37	44	1	0
Florida	0	384	40	26	116	N/A	113	88	N/A
Georgia	75	53	19	5	26	N/A	3	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	29	22	3	5	10	1	4	0	2
Idaho	12	13	1	3	4	2	2	1	0
Illinois	0	141	6	31	63	8	21	20	5
Indiana	25	71	4	11	38	2	16	6	0
Iowa	55	41	4	5	11	3	18	0	N/A
Kansas	0	117	4	38	22	N/A	6	21	N/A
Kentucky	42	38	4	1	18	7	7	3	N/A

<sup>1</sup>Alabama: Not included in total of 38 public sanctions.

<sup>2</sup>Connecticut: Does not include suspensions for non-payment of Client Security Fund fee.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Private Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Public Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments on Consent</u>	<u>No. of Suspensions</u>	<u>No. of Interim Suspensions (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>No. of Public Reprimands/ Censures</u>	<u>No. of Probations</u>	<u>No. of Transfers to Disability or Inactive Status</u>
Louisiana	21	79	46	7	46	8	17	17	8
Maine	27	19	0	1	3	0	9	N/A	40
Maryland	0	71	12	5	35	0	19	N/A	0
Massachusetts	67	90 <sup>3</sup>	15	6	39	5	28	2	2
Michigan	143	112	25	2	43	7 <sup>4</sup>	39	3	0
Minnesota	126	31	1	5	15	3	0	4	3
Mississippi	10	25	2	0	10	0	13	0	0
Missouri	98	47	21	3	18	3	5	7	N/A
Montana	21	16	11	0	2	0	3	5	2
Nebraska	17	13	3	1	5	2	2	0	3
Nevada	32	21	0	3	5	4	5	37	4
New Hampshire	N/A	21	2	0	1	0	18	0	0
New Jersey	N/A	192	11	12	61	31	117 <sup>5</sup>	0	0
New Mexico	10	9	3	1	4	1	1	4	0
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	76	60	18	7	29	10	7	N/A	1
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	165	38	11	6	17 <sup>6</sup>	N/A	4	N/A	N/A

<sup>3</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes Interim Suspensions.

<sup>4</sup>Michigan: These Suspensions not included in total of public sanctions issued.

<sup>5</sup>New Jersey: Includes 32 Admonitions.

<sup>6</sup>New York, 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist and 9th Jud. Dist.: Includes Interim Suspensions.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Private Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Public Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments on Consent</u>	<u>No. of Suspensions</u>	<u>No. of Interim Suspensions (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>No. of Public Reprimands/ Censures</u>	<u>No. of Probations</u>	<u>No. of Transfers to Disability Inactive Status</u>
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	72	26	5	7	12 <sup>6</sup>	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	144	21	4	7	8	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	116	28	11	1	11	N/A	5	N/A	N/A
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	180	27	2	2	13	5	11	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	35	52	2	1	14	1	38	6	1
North Dakota	16	9	2	0	5	2	3	0	1
Ohio	0	101	10	16	49	14	10	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	18	18	6	4	5	0	3	0	N/A
Oregon	0	112	1	11	25	1	75 <sup>7</sup>	1	0
Pennsylvania	82	87	11	27	37	10	2	N/A	5
Rhode Island	44	12	3	3	4	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	12	31	4	4	14	11	8	N/A	3
South Dakota	5	7	2	3	4	2	0	3	1
Tennessee	126	39	3	0	17	13 <sup>8</sup>	19	0	3
Texas	198	239	34	11	126 <sup>9</sup>	N/A	68	N/A	N/A

<sup>7</sup>Oregon: Includes 43 Admonitions which are public in Oregon.

<sup>8</sup>Tennessee: Interim Suspension is not a disciplinary sanction.

<sup>9</sup>Texas: Includes Interim Suspensions and Probations.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Private Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Public Sanctions</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments</u>	<u>No. of Disbarments on Consent</u>	<u>No. of Suspensions</u>	<u>No. of Interim Suspensions (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>No. of Public Reprimands/Censures</u>	<u>No. of Probations</u>	<u>No. of Transfers to Disability or Inactive Status</u>
Utah	25	24	2	2	3	4	11	1	1
Vermont	7	7	0	0	5	0	2	1	0
Virginia	129	94	17	10	24	N/A	42	N/A	2
Washington	N/A	86	21	15	31	11	21	9	1
West Virginia	N/A	28	3	0	1	4	20	0	0
Wisconsin	32	46	2	3	17	8	17	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	15	8	0	0	4	2	2	1	0
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2495</b>	<b>3725</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>1294</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>926</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

\*Some jurisdictions supplied partial data.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Filed</u>	<u>Total No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Granted</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
Alabama	10	4	1	3	3
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	10	10	1	9	0
Arkansas	8	7	0	7	1
California	21	21	21	0	3
Colorado	12	8	2	6	4
Connecticut	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delaware	2	2	0	2	0
District of Columbia	4	0	0	0	1
Florida	N/A	12	N/A	12	N/A
Georgia	2	2	0	2	0
Hawaii	4	2	0	2	2
Idaho	1	1	0	1	0
Illinois	3	1	1	0	3
Indiana	3	4	0	4	3
Iowa	6	6	0	6	0
Kansas	1	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	6	2	0	2	1
Louisiana	8	7	0	7	1
Maine	3	3	0	3	0

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</u>	<u>Total No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Granted</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
Maryland	9	5	0	5	4
Massachusetts	9	11	0	11	5
Michigan	6	6	0	6	2
Minnesota	13	13	0	13	1
Mississippi	5	1	0	1	1
Missouri	25	20	2	18	7
Montana	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Nebraska	2	2	0	2	0
Nevada	6	4 <sup>1</sup>	1	1	2
New Hampshire	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
New Jersey	N/A	15	0	15	N/A
New Mexico	1	1	0	1	0
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	27	14	4	10	7
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	13	4	1	3	9
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	1	0	0	0	1
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	10	4	1	3	6
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	16	9	0	9	7

<sup>1</sup>Nevada: Includes 2 Reinstatements granted from Disability Inactive Status.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Filed</u>	<u>Total No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Granted</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/ Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	10	5	0	5	3
North Carolina	4	4	4	0	2
North Dakota	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Ohio	2	N/A	0 <sup>2</sup>	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	17	0	0	0	17
Oregon	207 <sup>3</sup>	25	0 <sup>3</sup>	25	N/A
Pennsylvania	81	18	3	15	11
Rhode Island	3	3	2	1	0
South Dakota	1	0	0	0	1
Tennessee	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Texas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	5	2	0	2	0
Vermont	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Virginia	1	0	0	N/A	0
Washington	3	1	1	N/A	1
West Virginia	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Wisconsin	24	24	7	17	10
Wyoming	2	2	1	1	0

<sup>2</sup>Ohio and Oregon: All Disbarments are permanent.

<sup>3</sup>Oregon: There are many types of Reinstatement, not all related to prior discipline, such as inactive members and members suspended for non-payment of dues. There is not a precise breakdown of these categories by number.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. Carried Over From Prior Years</u>	<u>Average No. of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</u>
Arizona	208	N/A	108	150
Arkansas	250	250	205	255
California	52	52	62	62
Colorado	100	36	64	80
Delaware	114	16	168	148
District of Columbia	130	77	53	59
Florida	402	114	288	284
Georgia	24	16	18	17
Hawaii	92	N/A	94	51
Idaho	52.5	40	40.5	22
Illinois	62	58.9	169	165.4
Kansas	20	5	15	15
Kentucky	228	111	215	122
Louisiana	640	413	227	266
Maine	110	20	100	80
Maryland	55	48	52	48
Massachusetts	177	92	85	88
Michigan	138	N/A	120	120
Minnesota	28	36	41	40
Montana	325	89	279	296

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. Carried Over From Prior Years</u>	<u>Average No. of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</u>
New Mexico	118	24	121	89
New York -- 1st Jud. Dept.	42	71	114	120
New York -- 9th Jud. Dist.	81	81	137	185
New York -- 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	355	80	271	235
New York -- 3rd Jud. Dept.	543	257	286	292
New York -- 4th Jud. Dept.	145	75	350	335
Ohio (Office of Disciplinary Counsel)	108	59	146	143
Oklahoma	17	10	7	8
Oregon	80	N/A	160	200
Pennsylvania	194	35	158	158
Tennessee	120	N/A	N/A	140
Utah	294	121	173	187
Virginia	212	104	108	119
West Virginia	360	154	206	169

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
Alabama	N/A	1 Week	6 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months	6 Months
Alaska	Yes	66 Days	1026 Days	N/A	N/A	873 / 262 / 1953 / 638 Days <sup>1</sup>	N/A
Arizona	Yes	51 Days	304 Days	N/A	N/A	763 Days	345 Days
California	Yes	48 Days	202 Days	336 Days	442 Days	497 Days	364 Days
Colorado	No	1.8 Weeks	50.2 Weeks	44.8 Weeks	80.1 Weeks	80.1 Weeks	19 Weeks
Delaware	No	2 Weeks	90 Days	4 Months	5 Months	6-9 Months	3 Months
Florida	No	34 Days	115 - 193 Days	214 Days	N/A	199 Days	N/A
Georgia	N/A	1 Week	2 Months	8 Months	6 Months	1 Year	1 Year
Iowa	No	2 Days	N/A	18 Months	90 Days	180 Days	30 Days
Kansas	No	1 Month	6 Months	9 Months	N/A	1.5 Years	1 Year
Kentucky	No	4 Weeks	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8 Months
Louisiana	Yes	3 - 5 Days	309 Days	661 Days	1378 Days	528 Days	571 Days
Maine	No	30 Days	120 - 150 Days	10 Months	120 - 150 Days	15 Months	120 - 150 Days
Maryland	Yes	30 - 45 Days	90 - 120 Days	9 Months	N/A	18 Months	45 Days
Massachusetts	No	83 Days	175 Days	698 Days	460 Days	1046 Days	222 Days
Michigan	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	6 - 9 Months	N/A	6 Months
Minnesota	No	1 Month	7 Months	N/A	Admonition: 9 Mo. Probation: 20 Mo.	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup>Alaska: Disbarment/Suspension/Censure/Reprimand

CHART V  
CASE PROCESSING TIMES

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
Mississippi	No	90 Days	90 - 180 Days	90 - 180 Days	6 - 12 Months	6 - 12 Months	6 - 9 Months
Montana	No	45 Days	90 Days	6 Months	100 Days	1 Year	90 Days
Nebraska	Yes	1 - 2 Days	2 Months	6 Months	7 Months	1 - 2 Years	2 Months
Nevada	N/A	1 - 4 Weeks	30 - 90 Days	60 - 90 Days	60 - 90 Days	Uncontested: 4 - 9 Mo. Contested: 9 - 12 Mo.	60 - 90 Days
New Jersey	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	N/A	1 Month	6 Months - 1 Year	6 Months - 1 Year	1 Year	1 Year	6 Months - 1 Year
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	N/A	14 Days	6 Months	18 Months	18 Months	N/A	N/A
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11 Dist.	No	14 Days	4 Months	4 Months - 1 Year	4 - 8 Months	1 Year	1 Year
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Dist.	No	1 Week	9 Months - 1 Year	N/A	9 Months - 1 Year	N/A	N/A
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	N/A	3 Weeks	6 Months	1 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	N/A	60 Days	90 Days	120 Days	120 Days	6 Months - 1 Year	45 Days

CHART V  
CASE PROCESSING TIMES

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	N/A	14 Days	90 Days	9 Months	2 - 6 Months	1 Year	3 Months
North Dakota	Yes	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	6 Months	8 Months
Ohio	Yes	4 Weeks	60 - 150 Days	150+ Days	N/A	24 Months	6 Months (hearing)
Oklahoma	N/A	20 Days	90 Days	120 Days	3 Months	6 Months	6 Months
Oregon	Yes	14 Days	126 Days	375 Days	355 Days <sup>2</sup>	31 Months	60 Days - 31 Months <sup>3</sup>
Pennsylvania	Yes	5 Days	90 Days	15 Months	14 Months	24 Months	7 Months
Rhode Island	N/A	2 Days	90 Days	6 - 8 Months	8 - 10 Months	8 - 10 Months	6 Months
South Carolina	Yes	4 - 5 Days	60 - 90 Days	N/A	N/A	9 Months - 1 Year	N/A
South Dakota	No	3 - 7 Days	80 Days	120 - 180 Days	150 Days	240 Days	90 Days
Tennessee	Yes	1-5 Days	1 Year	6 Months	1 Year	1 - 2 Years	1 Year
Texas	N/A	13 Days	152 Days	20 Months	152 Days	20 Months	N/A
Utah	N/A	47 Days	221 Days	237 Days	388 Days	624 Days	172 Days
Vermont	N/A	30 Days	1 - 3 Months	4 - 6 Months	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	No	45 Days	140 Days	300 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	N/A	8 Days	10 Months	26 Months	N/A	15 Months	20 Months
Wisconsin	Yes	76 Days	375 Days	548 Days	709 Days	674 Days	255 Days
Wyoming	No	2 Weeks	4 Months	3 Months	2 Months	4 Months	2 Months

<sup>2</sup>Oregon: Time to Admonition rather than private sanction.

<sup>3</sup>Oregon: 60 days for uncontested; 31 months for contested.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
Alabama	14,101	732,349	732,349	Included in 732,349	100% Legislative appropriation.
Alaska	2,694	586,708	586,708	0	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Arkansas	8,500	N/A	569,463	18,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
California	145,713	30,869,069	30,869,069	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Colorado	20,647	4,132,420	2,942,872	11,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Connecticut	31,560	N/A	1,100,000	N/A	100% Supreme Court general budget.
Delaware	2,987	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
District of Columbia	56,140	3,815,425	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Florida	65,894	8,427,258	8,427,258	N/A	93% Bar Association earmarked dues, 7% cost reimbursement.
Georgia	34,561	1,808,816	1,808,816	26,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Hawaii	4,308	980,000	980,000	Included in 980,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Idaho	3,447	362,000	362,000	13,400	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Illinois	76,671	11,891,100	9,525,000	1,671,900	97.86% Supreme Court assessed fees; 1.58% interest earned and 0.56% recovered costs.
Indiana	14,918	1,654,206	1,621,569	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Iowa	8,031	467,387	467,387	Included in 467,387	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kansas	9,740	970,000	970,000	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kentucky	14,294	670,288	670,288	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Louisiana	19,337	3,034,150	2,088,941	1,243,169	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Maine	4,300	832,587	832,587	7,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Maryland	31,224	2,687,778	2,687,778	N/A	100% Supreme Court general budget.
Massachusetts	46,850	7,940,367	4,092,497	1,958,532	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
Michigan	35,224	3,796,367	2,753,607	935,045	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Minnesota	24,163	2,298,661	2,298,661	Included in 2,298,661	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Mississippi	9,235	408,865	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Missouri	26,883	1,998,260	1,758,260	240,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Montana	2,600	378,200	233,000	145,196	83% Bar Association earmarked dues; 17% Supreme Court general budget.
Nebraska	5,983	540,000	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Nevada	5,986	988,489	Included in 988,489	Included in 988,489	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
New Hampshire	4,066	605,105	Included in 605,105	N/A	94% Supreme Court assessed fees; 6% Character and Fitness Committee fees.
New Jersey	57,583	7,810,812	4,616,994	1,507,410	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
New Mexico	5,706	656,655	651,155	4,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	74,863	3,591,116	3,591,116	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	12,917	1,193,335	1,193,335	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	12,467	11,278,118	1,546,199	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	18,672	N/A	1,854,700	N/A	Part of Appellate Division, Second Dept. operating budget.
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	8,951	N/A	1,112,242	N/A	100% Attorney licensing fee.
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	12,000	N/A	1,732,071	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2003

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
North Carolina	19,745	825,575	218,221	44,818	100% Bar earmarked dues.
North Dakota	1,840	269,321	269,321	N/A	51% Bar Association earmarked dues and 49% Legislative appropriation.
Ohio	38,438	3,958,953	1,787,166	657,649	100% from attorney registration fees, then Disciplinary Counsel's annual budget allocation is approved by the Supreme Court.
Oklahoma	15,062	840,000	839,000	10,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Oregon	12,250	1,750,000	1,710,000	40,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Pennsylvania	55,360	7,659,387	7,659,387	Included in 7,659,387	92% Supreme Court assessed fees; 8% late payment fees, investments, and interest income.
Rhode Island	4,631	715,304	715,304	Included in 715,304	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
South Carolina	8,931	659,478	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court general budget.
South Dakota	2,000	62,000	20,000	62,000	85% Bar Association non-earmarked dues; 15% from the State Government on contract basis.
Tennessee	16,488	2,006,600	2,000,600	6,000	95% Supreme Court assessed fees; 5% interest earnings and reimbursement of expenses.
Texas	73,951	7,202,186	7,202,186	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Utah	6,273	730,000	730,000	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Vermont	2,500	328,969	N/A	N/A	50% Supreme Court assessed fees and 50% Legislative appropriation.
Virginia	24,197	3,722,930	3,267,105	27,000	100% Legal appropriation from Bar dues.
Washington	24,380	3,527,400	3,159,357	15,000	97% Bar Association dues; 3% cost recovery.
West Virginia	5,480	618,977	618,977	Included in 618,977	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Wisconsin	21,112	2,318,000	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Wyoming	1,953	115,450	93,000	3,400	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.

<sup>1</sup>North Dakota: Includes Judicial Conduct Commission Budget.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

Discipline Office Budget Includes:

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Salaries/Benefits</u>	<u>Space</u>	<u>Equipment/Supplies</u>	<u>Travel/Education/Training</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
Alabama	X	N/A	N/A	X	250
Alaska	X	X	X	X	440
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	290 / 435 / 0 / 240 / 195 / 255 <sup>1</sup>
Arkansas	X	N/A	X	X	100 / 175 <sup>2</sup>
California	X	X	X	X	390
Colorado	X	X	X	X	50 / 155 / 195 <sup>3</sup>
Connecticut	X	X	X	X	525
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	190 / 210 / 285 / 405 <sup>4</sup>
District of Columbia	X	N/A	X	X	150
Florida	X	X	X	X	175 / 265 <sup>5</sup>
Georgia	X	X	X	X	95 / 190 <sup>6</sup>
Hawaii	X	X	X	X	100 / 200 <sup>7</sup>
Idaho	X	X	X	X	55 / 90 / 140 / 255 / 340 <sup>8</sup>
Illinois	X	X	X	X	0 / 90 / 229 <sup>9</sup>
Indiana	X	X	X	X	105

<sup>1</sup>Arizona: 0-2 years in practice/2+ years in practice/over 70 years of age/inactive/retired/judicial.

<sup>2</sup>Arkansas: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>3</sup>Colorado: Inactive/ 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>4</sup>Delaware: Government employee/1-5 years in practice/ 5-10 years in practice/10+ years in practice.

<sup>5</sup>Florida: Inactive/active.

<sup>6</sup>Georgia: Inactive/active.

<sup>7</sup>Hawaii: 0-4 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>8</sup>Idaho: 72 years of age/less than 6 months in practice/6 months-1 year in practice/1-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>9</sup>Illinois: Less than 1 year in practice/1-3 years in practice or inactive/3+ years in practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

Discipline Office Budget Includes:

STATE	Salaries/Benefits	Space	Equipment/Supplies	Travel/Education/Training	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
Iowa	X	X	X	X	135
Kansas	X	X	X	X	135
Kentucky	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90 / 171 / 221 <sup>10</sup>
Louisiana	X	X	X	X	100 / 165 <sup>11</sup>
Maine	X	X	X	X	67 / 87 / 192 <sup>12</sup>
Maryland	X	N/A	X	X	85
Massachusetts	X	N/A	X	X	165 / 220 / 20 <sup>13</sup>
Michigan	X	X	X	X	260
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	89 / 200 <sup>14</sup>
Mississippi	X	X	X	X	250
Missouri	X	X	X	X	133 / 143 / 198 <sup>15</sup>
Montana	X	X	X	X	160
Nebraska	X	X	X	X	200 / 300 <sup>16</sup>
Nevada	X	X	X	X	250 / 350 / 500 <sup>17</sup>

<sup>10</sup>Kentucky: Judges/0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>11</sup>Louisiana: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>12</sup>Maine: 50+ years in practice/less than 3 years in practice/3-49 years in practice.

<sup>13</sup>Massachusetts: 0-5 years in practice/5-50 years in practice/50+ years in practice.

<sup>14</sup>Minnesota: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>15</sup>Missouri: Nonresident/resident 0-3 years in practice/resident 3+ years in practice.

<sup>16</sup>Nebraska: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>17</sup>Nevada: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice/annual fee for multijurisdictional practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

Discipline Office Budget Includes:

STATE	Salaries/Benefits	Space	Equipment/Supplies	Travel/Education/Training	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	420 / 440 <sup>18</sup>
New Jersey	X	X	X	X	28 / 165 / 190 <sup>19</sup>
New Mexico	X	X	X	X	265 / 315 <sup>20</sup>
New York 1st. Jud. Dept.	X	N/A	X	X	350 (\$175 biennially)
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	X	X	X	X	350 (\$175 biennially)
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	X	X	X	X	350 (\$175 biennially)
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	350 (\$175 biennially)
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	X	X	X	X	350 (\$175 biennially)
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	X	X	X	X	350 (\$175 biennially)
North Carolina	X	N/A	X	X	175
North Dakota	X	X	X	X	250 / 275 / 305 <sup>21</sup>
Ohio	X	X	X	X	275 biennially

<sup>18</sup>New Hampshire: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>19</sup>New Jersey: 0-2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/5-49 years in practice.

<sup>20</sup>New Mexico: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>21</sup>North Dakota: Less than 1 year in practice/1-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

Discipline Office Budget Includes:

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Salaries/Benefits</u>	<u>Space</u>	<u>Equipment/Supplies</u>	<u>Travel/Education/Training</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
Oklahoma	X	N/A	X	X	87 / 175 <sup>22</sup>
Oregon	X	X	X	X	0 / 115 / 360 / 432 <sup>23</sup>
Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X	175
Rhode Island	X	N/A	X	X	350
South Carolina	X	X	X	X	150 / 220 <sup>24</sup>
South Dakota	X	N/A	N/A	X	0 / 195 / 315 <sup>25</sup>
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	105
Texas	X	X	X	X	
Utah	X	X	X	X	190 / 350 <sup>26</sup>
Vermont	X	X	X	X	150
Virginia	X	X	X	X	250
Washington	X	X	X	X	105 / 183 / 300 / 368 <sup>27</sup>
West Virginia	X	X	X	X	50 / 150 / 195 <sup>28</sup>
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	129
Wyoming	X	N/A	X	N/A	137 / 250 <sup>29</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Oklahoma: Less than three years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>23</sup>Oregon: 50+ years in practice/15+ years in practice and limited to pro bono work/less than 2 years in practice/2+ years in practice.

<sup>24</sup>South Carolina: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>25</sup>South Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-4 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>26</sup>Utah: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>27</sup>Washington: Less than 1 year in practice/2-3 years in practice/4-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>28</sup>West Virginia: Inactive or less than 1 year in practice/1-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.

<sup>29</sup>Wyoming: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

CHART VIII

STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL'S OFFICE

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	Chief Disciplinary Counsel	Other Disciplinary Counsel	Other Lawyers	Investigators	Legal Assistants/ Paralegals	Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.	Law Students/ Clerks	Auditors	Probation Monitors	Other Paid Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies
Alabama	1	3	0	0; 1	2	5; 1	0	0	0	0	11; 2	16%
Alaska	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	N/A
Arizona	1	8; 1	0	2	1.5	6	0	1.5	0	2	21; 1	N/A
Arkansas	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	28%
California	1	7	58	62	20	76	7	0	4	20	255	0
Colorado	1	2	11	4 <sup>1</sup>	N/A	10	1	1	1	1	32	0%
Connecticut	1	6; 2	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	15; 2	33%
Delaware	1	2	0	0	0	1; 1	0	0; 2	0	0	4; 1	33%
District of Columbia	1	10	1	1	1	8	11	0	0	0	33	33%
Florida	7	25	0	0; 25	12	50	0	5	0	0	99; 25	33%
Georgia	1	7	2	1	4	4	0	0	N/A	0	19	N/A
Hawaii	1	4; 2	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	12; 2	1%
Idaho	1	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	7	66%
Illinois	1	37.5	3	11	13.5	14	0; 3	0	0.5; 1	0	80.5; 4	33%
Indiana	1	0	9; 1	1	0	3	0; 3	0	0	0	14; 4	22%
Iowa	1	3	0; 1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	7; 1	20%
Kansas	1	2	2	2	0	3	1	0; 1	0	0	11; 1	0%
Kentucky	1	4	0	0	3	4	0; 1	0	0	0	12; 1	33%; 20% <sup>2</sup>
Louisiana	1	9	0	4; 1	0	13; 1	0	0	0	14; 4	41; 6	33%
Maine	1	2	0	0	2	3	0; 1	0	0	1	9; 1	33%

<sup>1</sup>Colorado: Includes paralegals/legal assistants.

<sup>2</sup>Kentucky: Initiating level/appellate level.

CHART VIII

STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL'S OFFICE

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

	<u>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers</u>	<u>Investigators</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Auditors</u>	<u>Probation Monitors</u>	<u>Other Paid Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>	<u>% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies</u>
Maryland	1	2	7	7	2	12	0	0	0	0	31	0
Massachusetts	1	17	0	16.5	0	14.75	0	0	0	0	49.25	25% (varies)
Michigan <sup>3</sup>	2	13	0	5	1	15	0	0	0	1	47	33% <sup>4</sup>
Minnesota	1	7; 1	0	0	4; 1	8; 1	0; 1	0	0	0	20; 4	39%
Mississippi	1	1	0	0	0	1; 1	0	0	0	0	3; 1	0
Missouri	1	5	1; 11	0	3	6; 1	0	0	0	0; 1	16; 13	33%
Montana	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	25%
Nebraska	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	33%
Nevada	1	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	0 <sup>5</sup>	0	9	N/A
New Hampshire	1	0	3	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	10	35%
New Jersey	1	9.5	1.5	19	0	22	0; 2	5	0	2	60; 2	33%
New Mexico	1	3; 1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0; 2	7; 3	N/A
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	1	20	0	6	5	10	0; 1	1	N/A	2	45; 1	20%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	1	8	1	1	1	5	0; 1	1	0	0	18; 1	20%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	1	8	0	1	0	7	0	0; 1	0	0	17; 1	20%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	1	0; 1	9	2	1	7	N/A	0	0	0	20; 1	20%

<sup>3</sup>Michigan: Combined numbers for Attorney Grievance Commission and Attorney Discipline Board.

<sup>4</sup>Michigan: For Attorney Grievance Commission and Disciplinary Board for Appellate Review.

<sup>5</sup>Nevada: Probation monitoring performed by one paralegal.

CHART VIII

STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL'S OFFICE

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2003

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

	Chief Disciplinary Counsel	Other Disciplinary Counsel	Other Lawyers	Investigators	Legal Assistants/ Paralegals	Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.	Law Students/ Clerks	Auditors	Probation Monitors	Other Paid Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	1	3	5	6	0	7; 1	0; 2	0	0	0	22; 3	14%
North Carolina	1	3.15	5	5.4	0.75	2.95	0	1	0	0	19.25	33%
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	33%
Ohio: Discipline Counsel's Office	1	1	6	2; 1	2	9	0; 1	0	0	0	21; 2	14%
Oklahoma	1	4	0	4	0	4	0; 1	0	0	0	13; 1	33%
Oregon	1	7	0	1	1	5; 0.6	0	0	0	0	15; 0.6	33%
Pennsylvania	1	1	25	8	0	19	0; 3.5	3	0	0	57; 3.5	1%
Rhode Island	1	1	2	1	0	3; 1	0	0	0	0	8; 1	33%
South Carolina	1	1	5	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	13	0
South Dakota	0; 1	0; 1	0; 1	0	0	0; 0.5	0	0	0	0	0; 3	14%
Tennessee	1	7	1	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	18	0%
Texas	1	19	0	21	15	39; 1	0; 1	0	3	0	98; 2	33%
Utah	1	5	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	10	23%
Vermont	1	1	0	0	0	0.625	0	0	0	0	2.625	33%
Virginia	1	11	6	11	2	7	0	0	0	0	38	20%
Washington	1	15	0	3	6	7	0; 0.25	0	0	N/A	32; 0.25	0%
West Virginia	1	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	7	33%
Wisconsin	1	2	0	12; 2	0	8; 1	0	0	0	0	23; 3	33%
Wyoming	0; 1	0	0	0	0; 1	0	0	0	0	0	0; 2	28%