

**2005 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**  
ELLCOTT CITY, MD

**DAVID S. BAKER**  
ATLANTA, GA

**ANTHONY L. BUTLER**  
SEATTLE, WA

**GERALD M. EISENSTAT**  
VINELAND, NJ

**HON. LARRY RAMIREZ**  
LAS CRUCES, NM

**ARNOLD R. 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

# **2005 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)**

## **Introduction to 2005 S.O.L.D. Survey Results**

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2005 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. Fifty-five agencies responded to the questionnaire. West Virginia did not respond to the survey. Medians and averages of various categories are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2005 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 and are noted as such. 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 \(MRD\)](#).

## **2005 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  
2005 DATA**

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

Person Reporting: \_\_\_\_\_

Tel.# \_\_\_\_\_

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

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 as 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 Survey 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.

**We appreciate your cooperation in helping us collect this vital data and your timely responses are especially appreciated. Please return the completed Survey Questionnaire as indicated on the following page by June 1, 2006. Prompt responses to the questionnaire allow us to publish the data in a manner that is most useful to disciplinary agencies and the public, and reduces the number of follow up inquiries that we have to make.**

**We will no longer be publishing print versions of the Survey, although each chief disciplinary counsel will receive one printed copy. The Survey will be published electronically on the Center for Professional Responsibility's web site. We will start posting available data for the 2005 Survey on August 1, 2006. We will post the data of those jurisdictions that have responded to the Survey Questionnaire after August 1st as it is received. If you have questions regarding the timing of your response due to your fiscal year, please contact Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel at [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org) as soon as possible.**

The Survey questionnaire is intended to be as brief as possible, while still allowing us to gather essential, accurate and complete information. There is a need provide standardized data for national comparisons, and we understand that this can be complicated by the diversity of lawyer disciplinary systems and terminology utilized by the various agencies. As a result, where necessary, please provide footnotes to any responses where there is a major variation in procedures. Any suggestions for future modifications that would increase the usefulness of the Survey are welcome and appreciated. Thank you for completing the Survey.

In order for the Center to maintain accurate information for each jurisdiction in the **Directory of Lawyer Disciplinary Agencies** at <http://www.abanet.org/cpr/regulation/scpd/disciplinary.html>, 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY JUNE 1, 2006, TO:**

Susan E. Dianovsky  
American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
321 North Clark Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60610-4714  
PH: 312-988-6223  
FAX: 312-988-5491 or 312-988-5280

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

## **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 I. CASE PROCESSING AND SANCTION STATISTICS**

Please fill in the appropriate figures for calendar year 2005 or for your fiscal year ending in the month of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005. 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 contact Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel, at [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org).

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 **2005** calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS**

2. Total number of complaints (as defined in Terms and Phrases) received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct during the **2005** calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency prior to the commencement of the **2005** 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 **2005** 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 **2005** calendar/fiscal year.):

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the **2005** calendar/fiscal year. (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the **2005** 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 **2005** calendar/fiscal year after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant formal charges.

---

7. Total number of lawyers against whom formal charges were brought/initiated in calendar/fiscal year **2005**:

---

**C. SANCTIONS**

8. Does your jurisdiction have private/non-public disciplinary sanctions? \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what is the total number of lawyers who received private, i.e., non-public, disciplinary sanctions during calendar/fiscal year **2005**:

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Total number of lawyers who were transferred to disability inactive status in the calendar/fiscal year **2005**:

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year **2005**:

\_\_\_\_\_

11. Of the total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions, what is the breakdown of:

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

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

c. Total lawyers suspended (excluding interim suspensions): \_\_\_\_\_

d. Total lawyers intermly suspended (for risk of harm or for criminal conviction): \_\_\_\_\_

e. Total lawyers publicly reprimanded/censured: \_\_\_\_\_

f. Total lawyers placed on probation (including probation imposed with other sanctions): \_\_\_\_\_

**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 **2005**: \_\_\_\_\_

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 **2005**:

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART II. CASE LOAD**

**A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**

15. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2005**? (Caseload or cases 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 **2005** from previous years?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2005**?

\_\_\_\_\_

18. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year **2005**?

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. TIME GUIDELINES**

19. In response to the **2005** survey, the following jurisdictions indicated that they have formally adopted time guidelines for case processing: AK, CA, LA, MD, MS, NE, NV, NJ, OH, OR, PA, SC, VA, and WI. If your jurisdiction has adopted such formal time guidelines, indicate so below, and provide a brief description or a copy of them:

---

---

---

**C. CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

20. 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 I., B. -- Case Processing Statistics of this Survey?

\_\_\_\_\_

21. 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?

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

23. 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: \_\_\_\_\_

24. 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 III. FEES, DUES, AND BUDGET**

**A. 2005 BUDGET**

25. Total budget for the lawyer discipline system in the **2005** calendar/fiscal year: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

26. If different than response to Question 25, total budget for disciplinary counsel's office:  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

27. 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: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

28. If different than response to Question 25, total budget for disciplinary board administration:  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

29. 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**

Please respond to the following for calendar year **2005** or for your fiscal year ending in the month of \_\_\_\_\_, **2005**.

30. 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 IV. STAFFING OF THE DISCIPLINARY AGENCY**

**Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for 2005 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?	_____	_____

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Alabama	14,821	1,487 <sup>1</sup>	215	1,060	301	149	46
Alaska	2,781	232	63	196	38	24	14
Arizona	13,619	4,940	946	1,061	2,070	821	75
Arkansas	8,600	942	718	0	976	183	148
California	151,975	15,817 <sup>2</sup>	4,540	12,032	5,106	2,320	429
Colorado	21,320	3,929 <sup>3</sup>	42	3,417	353	82	54
Connecticut	33,700	1,194	NA	133	1,061	939	255
Delaware	2,668	455	38	83	410	352	21
District of Columbia	60,640	1,380	405	951	834 <sup>4</sup>	459	20
Florida	77,102	8,451	3,479	1,187	10,752	6,525	NA

<sup>1</sup>Alabama: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>2</sup>California: Includes matters handled by central intake. The State Bar of California defines a complaint as a communication concerning the conduct of a member received by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel which is designated for evaluation to determine if any action is warranted by the State Bar. Reportable Actions are included in this number although they are statutorily required reports from courts, insurers, financial institutions, and members of the State Bar.

<sup>3</sup>Colorado: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>4</sup>District of Columbia: 405 cases carried over from 2004. 429 new docketed matters during 2005.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Georgia	28,689	2,500 <sup>5</sup>	123	2,039	356	112	123
Hawaii	4,573	602	529	247	883	361	9
Idaho	3,637	344	81	387	206	46	13
Illinois	80,041	6,082 <sup>6</sup>	1,944	1,460	6,566	4,239	147
Indiana	15,508	1,625	818	957	1,486	629	41
Iowa	8,269	814	155	50	659	499	50
Kansas	10,100	937	NA	382	555	283	48
Kentucky	14,960	1,305 <sup>7</sup>	717	775	1,259	388	52
Louisiana	20,049	2,790	2,611	1,496	3,905	1,149	62
Maine	4,760	399	60	65	338	257	22

<sup>5</sup>Georgia: Excludes 22,429 inquiries received by Consumer Assistance Program, of which about 17% were referred to the office of General Counsel for forms and constituting the complaints received.

<sup>6</sup>Illinois: Includes 3,697 matters handled by central intake. As of 6-5-06, intake concluded 3,659 of the complaints received in 2005 and had pending an additional 38 complaints, for a total of

<sup>7</sup>Kentucky: Includes 77 matters handled by Consumer Assistance Program during the 2005-2006 fiscal year.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005

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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Maryland	33,000	2,031	415	1,562	884	472	115
Massachusetts	48,927	929 <sup>8</sup>	1,183	10 <sup>9</sup>	2112	862	162
Michigan	35,920	3,541	NA	2667	884	461	111
Minnesota	25,576	1,150	525	556	1,119	389	36
Mississippi	9,711	457 <sup>10</sup>	107	273	37	6	17
Missouri	28,076	2,410 <sup>11</sup>	NA	1,475	1,584	NA	32
Montana	3,254	429	272	156	393	328	20
Nebraska	6,188	566	95	172	394	284	40
Nevada	6,321	1,362	NA	136 <sup>12</sup>	1,226 <sup>13</sup>	98 <sup>14</sup>	16
New Hampshire	4,241	235	251	124	169	79	26
New Jersey	61,360	7,370	1,154	5,896	1,474	1,160	226

<sup>8</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes 5,672 matters handled by central intake, but there is some overlap. Central intake handled 4,752 matters that did not become complaints referred to Bar Counsel.

<sup>9</sup>Massachusetts: Estimated.

<sup>10</sup>Mississippi: Excludes matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>11</sup>Missouri: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>12</sup>Nevada: Estimated.

<sup>13</sup>Nevada: Data does not provide "carry over" statistics. 969 cases were investigated, but no grievance file opened, plus 257 grievance files opened for a combined total of 1,226.

<sup>14</sup>Nevada: Of 257 grievance files opened, 81 were dismissed outright or dismissed with letters of caution, and 17 were closed with private reprimands.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
New Mexico	6,045	522	121	427	77	0	14
New York 1st Judicial Department	76,777	3,371	1,238	737	3,495	1,957	21
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Districts	13,000	2,368	581	1,044	1,268	309	34
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th District	13,119	1,976	730	614	812	763	29
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	19,348	2,955	1,116	1,509	1,116	930	26
New York 3rd Judicial Department	9,221	1,688	1,623	1,057	735	516	191
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,000	2,524	665	961	3,419	1,024	79
North Carolina	20,651	1,392 <sup>15</sup>	NA	NA	NA	1,111	54
North Dakota	1,866	222	122	60	217	176	NA

<sup>15</sup>North Carolina: Excludes approximately 18,380 incoming calls, 2,011 letters and 450 email inquiries received by separate Consumer Assistance Program.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005

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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Ohio	36,473	6,526	381 <sup>16</sup>	4,284	2,242	1,043 <sup>16</sup>	106
Oklahoma	14,206	427	197	1174	428	349	18
Oregon	12,770	2,297 <sup>17</sup>	NA	800 <sup>18</sup>	1,500 <sup>18</sup>	1,330 <sup>18</sup>	131 <sup>19</sup>
Pennsylvania	57,086	4,716	1,007	94	5,629	4,031	228
Rhode Island	4,865	424	NA	87	337	328	4
South Carolina	9,600	1,383	798	199	1,982	1,005	18 <sup>20</sup>
South Dakota	2,153	113 <sup>21</sup>	7	15	98	92	85
Tennessee	17,389	1,268 <sup>22</sup>	NA	286	1,043 <sup>23</sup>	1,171 <sup>23</sup>	59 <sup>23</sup>
Texas	76,760	7,013 <sup>24</sup>	NA	4,654	2,495	2,104	665

<sup>16</sup>Ohio: This response applies to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel only, and does not include complaints that were filed with the 35 Certified Grievance Committees.

<sup>17</sup>Oregon: Includes 2,210 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>18</sup>Oregon: Estimated.

<sup>19</sup>Oregon: Excludes 43 admonitions.

<sup>20</sup>South Carolina: Number of complaints, not number of lawyers charged.

<sup>21</sup>South Dakota: Excludes 15 summarily dismissed complaints.

<sup>22</sup>Tennessee: Excludes 4,644 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>23</sup>Tennessee: Excludes matters from previous years.

<sup>24</sup>Texas: Excludes 54,152 contacts with and 1,131 cases handled by consumer assistance program.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005

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 Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Utah	6,584	1,017 <sup>25</sup>	742	1,066	693	133	57
Vermont	2,000	264 <sup>26</sup>	65	86	247	131	10
Virginia	25,193	4,260	781	2,186	2,047	789	NA
Washington	25,160	2,540 <sup>27</sup>	915 <sup>28</sup>	1,483 <sup>28</sup>	1,068 <sup>28</sup>	926	93
Wisconsin	18,023	2,105	738	1,653	2,843	2,150	39
Wyoming	2,060	218	13	70*	135	80	35
<b>TOTAL*</b>	1,323,735	128,294	33,326	65,481	82,316	46,404	4426
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	24,068	2333	741	1235	1,524	859	167
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	14,206	1,383	529	775	930	460	4426

\*West Virginia did not provide data.

<sup>25</sup>Utah: Excludes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>26</sup>Vermont: Excludes 245 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>27</sup>Washington: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>28</sup>Washington: Method of calculation changed.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred</u>	<u>Of Total Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended Excluding Interim Suspensions</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Publicly Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</u>
Alabama	46	51	2	2	18	5	20	4	2
Alaska	3	7	2	0	2	0	3	0	3
Arizona	0	112	4	2	22	8	68	49	4
Arkansas	33	99	7	12	17	5	72	0	1
California	67	426	57	68	229	75	72	176	9
Colorado	5	59	17	2	38	15	1	19	10
Connecticut	NA	145	4	9	21	6	58 <sup>1</sup>	NA	6
Delaware	9	15	3	0	7	0	5	2	0
District of Columbia	NA	106	20	6	36	35	15 <sup>2</sup>	6	2
Florida	NA	396	33	4	137	30	65 <sup>3</sup>	54	5
Georgia	57	69	22	10	25	NA	9	NA	NA
Hawaii	28	18	5	3	8	0	2	NA	1
Idaho	42	15	1	1	6	3	7	5	0
Illinois	0	166	15	17	85	12	30	21	1
Indiana	20	53	1	12	23	3	17	6	0
Iowa	70	25	1	1	5	0	19	0	NA

<sup>1</sup>Connecticut: 5 by the Court, 53 by Statewide Grievance Committee.

<sup>2</sup>District of Columbia: Bar Counsel also issued 27 admonitions.

<sup>3</sup>Florida: 67 admonishments were also issued.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended Excluding Interim Suspensions</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Publicly Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</u>
Kansas	NA	47	8	5	6	1	26	1	3
Kentucky	56	44	3	1	22	5	13	7	NA
Louisiana	38	52	10	7	30	19	12	16	11
Maine	NA <sup>4</sup>	19 <sup>5</sup>	3	3	1	1	7	0	NA
Maryland	0	72	10	14	22	1	25	0	1
Massachusetts	43	89 <sup>6</sup>	11	10	39	12	29 <sup>7</sup>	2 <sup>8</sup>	1
Michigan	165	117	19	1	57	9	29	2	0
Minnesota	113	35	2	4	22	7	7	10	2
Mississippi	14	23	6	3	5	1	8	NA	2
Missouri	94	43	15	2	14	2	5	6	0
Montana	51	18	1	NA	6	1	8	2	2
Nebraska	13	20	5	3	3	5	4	5	0
Nevada	28	27	4	2	13	3	5	9	1
New Hampshire	NA	17	4	0	5	2	9	0	NA
New Jersey	NA	178	19	11	45	33	42 <sup>9</sup>	0	2

<sup>4</sup>Maine: Does not have "non-public discipline" but issued 17 non-public informal "Dismissals With Warning," which are not a form of discipline.

<sup>5</sup>Maine: Four of these were public non-disciplinary warnings.

<sup>6</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes interim suspensions.

<sup>7</sup>Massachusetts: Includes 5 reciprocal disciplinary sanctions.

<sup>8</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes ethics school.

<sup>9</sup>New Jersey: 34 reprimands; 8 censures.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended Excluding Interim Suspensions</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Publicly Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</u>
New Mexico	6	8	1	1	5	1	1	5	NA
New York 1st Judicial Department	75	61	21	8	15	9	6	NA	2
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Jud. Districts	145	44	13	11	19	19	1	NA	NA
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	49	22	7	1	11	11	3	NA	NA
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	55	35	6	11	9	5	4	NA	20
New York 3rd Judicial Department	109	29	11	NA	13	3	5	NA	0
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th and 8th Jud. Dist.	166	25	7	4	10	NA	4	NA	0
North Carolina	34	79	12	9	22	3	36	16	6
North Dakota	19	11	2	0	4	1	5	5	0
Ohio	0 <sup>10</sup>	93	6	9	44	22	8	NA	NA
Oklahoma	24	18	0	9	5	0	4	0	NA
Oregon	NA	111	2	9	35	3	22	1	0

<sup>10</sup>Ohio: Does not recognize Private Reprimands as a sanction.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended Excluding Interim Suspensions</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Publicly Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>	<u>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</u>
Pennsylvania	134	116	19	18	51	15	2	24	6
Rhode Island	29	11	NA	3	2	0	3	3	NA
South Carolina	29	26	0	3	12	13	11	NA	1
South Dakota	20	5	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
Tennessee	99	56	4	0	17	14 <sup>11</sup>	35	NA	4 <sup>11</sup>
Texas	108	236	38 <sup>12</sup>	NA	119	2	62	NA	0
Utah	24	42	4	3	7	5	27	NA	1
Vermont	5	7	0	1	1	3	3	1	0
Virginia	126	77	5	10	25	NA	31	NA	2
Washington	NA	80 <sup>13</sup>	9	4	31	15	22	6	1
Wisconsin	16	39	2	4	17	21	15	0	0
Wyoming	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	NA	0
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2,270</b>	<b>3,799</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>1,006</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

\*West Virginia did not provide data.

<sup>11</sup>Tennessee: Not a disciplinary sanction.

<sup>13</sup>Texas: Does not distinguish between types of disbarment.

<sup>12</sup>Washington: Includes Admonitions.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</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	5	1	4	0
Alaska	1	0	NA	1
Arizona	2	0	0	0
Arkansas	13	0	11	2
California	18	18	0	11
Colorado	5	1	2	1
Connecticut	1	NA	NA	0
Delaware	3	0	2	1
District of Columbia	7	0	1	2
Florida	NA	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA
Georgia	1	NA	1	0
Hawaii	1	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois	8	0	0	2
Indiana	4	0	4	2
Iowa	6	0	6	0
Kansas	4	0	2	1
Kentucky	7	0	0	2
Louisiana	9	4	5	2
Maine	0	NA	NA	NA

<sup>1</sup>Florida: 11 total granted, but not distinguishable based on granted after disbarment or suspension.

<sup>2</sup>Indiana: Reinstatements granted were all on matters filed in a prior year, not on cases filed in 2005.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</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	10	0	10	1
Massachusetts	15 <sup>3</sup>	0	15	2
Michigan	11	0	11	3
Minnesota	10	1	5	1
Mississippi	3	NA	1	1
Missouri	39 <sup>4</sup>	3	5	3
Montana	1	0	0	0
Nebraska	5	0	3	1
Nevada	3	0	2	1
New Hampshire	0	0	0	1
New Jersey	NA	0	18	NA
New Mexico	3	1	2	0
New York 1st Judicial Department	13	5	4	1
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Judicial Districts	9	NA	NA	1
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	0	0	0	0
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	8	2	1	5
New York 3rd Judicial Department	6	1	5	NA

<sup>3</sup>Massachusetts: 8 were automatic reinstatements after short suspensions.

<sup>4</sup>Missouri: Includes petitions related to discipline, fees and restoration from inactive status.

New York

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</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>
4th Judicial Department	9	0	5	4
North Carolina	2	0	0	2
North Dakota	1	0	1	0
Ohio	11	0	7 <sup>5</sup>	NA
Oklahoma	10	0	1	3
Oregon	175*	0	25*	NA
Pennsylvania	94	6	11	14
Rhode Island	2	0	2	1
South Dakota	1	0	1	0
Tennessee	10	NA	NA	3
Texas	6	NA <sup>6</sup>	NA <sup>6</sup>	1
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	NA	NA	NA
Washington	0	NA	NA	0
West Virginia <sup>7</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	26	0	3	2
Wyoming	1	1	0	0

\* = Estimated.

<sup>5</sup>Ohio: "suspensions for term".

<sup>6</sup>Texas: Total of 5 reinstatements granted, but statistic does not distinguish between those granted after suspension or after disbarment.

<sup>7</sup>West Virginia did not provide data.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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	234	95	120	82
Arkansas	250*	180*	230*	207*
California	52 <sup>1</sup>	49	63	19
Colorado	107	16	96	106
Connecticut	73	NA	110	45
Delaware	102	9	114	88
District of Columbia	93	45	48	51
Florida	374	109	264	310
Georgia	27	15	17	15
Hawaii	92	NA	93	65
Idaho	297	110	187	259
Illinois	55	58	168	177
Iowa	226	45	181	150
Kansas	250	NA	250	NA
Kentucky	237	167	110	81
Louisiana	536	342	194	215
Maine	124	20	133	128
Maryland	38	41	47	53
Massachusetts <sup>2</sup>	141	79	66	71
Michigan	55 <sup>3</sup>	NA	100 <sup>3</sup>	96*
Minnesota	36	37	36	37
Mississippi	35	10	25	25
Montana	701	272	429	371
Nebraska	131	32	120	95

\* = Estimated.

<sup>1</sup>California: This number only refers to cases that are part of the attorney's official caseload. If supervised cases included, the average is 83 per attorney.

<sup>2</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes central intake caseload numbers.

<sup>3</sup>Michigan: Investigative files only.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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	97	13	85	43
New York 1st Judicial Department	45	62	167	113
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	95	95	151	210
New York; 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	116	111	295	263
New York 3rd Judicial Department	552	271	281	278
New York 4th Judicial Department	455	89	367	341
North Carolina	NA	NA	NA	11 formal; 329 investigations
Ohio <sup>4</sup>	88	64	180	163
Oklahoma	14	9	6	6
Oregon	45*	NA	60*	74*
Pennsylvania	208	38	175	174
South Carolina	106	NA	161	NA
Tennessee	96	NA	NA	147
Texas	14	NA	NA	NA
Utah	295	295	171	220
Vermont	124	42	67	65
Virginia	186	71	115	103

\* = Estimated.

<sup>4</sup>Ohio: Case loads apply to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) only and do not include the staff at the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline (BoC).

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	Time Standards Formally Adopted	Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction	Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Alabama	NA	1 Week*	6 Months*	12 Months*	9 Months*	12 Months*	6 Months*
Alaska	Yes	73 Days	679 Days	NA	1322 Days	897 Days for Disbarment 3402 Days for Suspension 1156 Days for Public Censure 94 Days for Public Reprimand	37 Days
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	15 Days*
Arizona	Yes	43 Days	156 Days	377 Days	NA	634 Days	655 Days
California	Yes	48 Days	190 Days	405 Days	541 Days	621 Days*	417 Days
Colorado	No	1.6 Weeks	29.7 Weeks	33.3 Weeks	68.3 Weeks	82.7 Weeks	22.4 Weeks
Connecticut	Yes	14 Days	104 Days	103 Days	NA	225 Days	NA
Delaware	NA	7 Days	45 Days	120 Days	120 Days	210 Days	120 Days
Florida		28 Days	64 - 96 Days	162 Days	NA	338 Days	NA
Georgia	No	5 Days	60 Days	8 Months	10 Months	1 Year	3 Months
Idaho	NA	2 Weeks*	6 Months*	1 Year*	1 Year*	2 Years*	3 Months*
Iowa	NA	4 Days	6 Months	18 Months	6 Months	12 Months	3 Months
Kansas	NA	1 Week	See below <sup>1</sup>	9 Months - 1 Year	NA	1 - 1.5 Years	1 - 1.5 Years
Kentucky	No	4 Weeks*	5 Months*	16 Months*	NA	30 Months*	NA
Louisiana	Yes	3 Days	370 Days	378 Days	623 Days	1265 Days	549 Days
Maine	NA	7 Days	3 - 5 Months	6 - 8 Months	3 - 5 Months	6 - 8 Months	3 - 4 Months
Maryland	Yes	30 Days	120 Days	9 Months	NA	12 - 13 Months	30 Days

\* = Estimated.

<sup>1</sup>Kansas: 70% of investigations only involve requesting the attorney to respond informally. The average time in that situation is approximately 30 - 45 days. Cases that are formally investigated take approximately 6 months.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	Time Standards Formally Adopted	Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction	Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction	Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Massachusetts <sup>2</sup>	NA	10 Days	312 Days	752 Days	675 Days	1041 Days	273 Days <sup>3</sup>
Michigan	NA	45-60 Days	NA	NA	NA	NA	168 Days
Minnesota	NA	1 Month	7 Months	NA	Admonition = 10 Mos. Probation = 15 Mos.		
Mississippi	NA	90 Days	90 Days	180 Days	90 Days	90 Days	270 Days
Montana		2 Weeks	90 Days	6 Months	100 Days	1 Year	NA
Nebraska	Yes	1 - 2 Days*	30 - 60 Days*	4 - 7 Months*	5 - 8 Months*	1 - 2 Years*	2 Months*
Nevada	Yes	1 - 4 Weeks*	30 - 60 Days* <sup>4</sup>	60 - 120 Days*	60 - 90 Days*	Uncontested: 4 - 9 Months Contested: 9 - 12 Months	60 - 90 Days
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 Years 5 Months	NA
New Mexico	NA	1 Month	6 Months - 1 Year	6 Months - 1 Year	1 Year*	1 Year*	6 Months - 1 Year*
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	NA	14 Days	6 Months	22 Months	20 Months	NA	NA
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	NA	2 Weeks	4 Months	4 Months - 1 Year	4 - 8 Months	1.5 Years	1 Year
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	NA	1 Week	9 Months - 1 Year	NA	9 Months - 1 Year	NA	NA
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	NA	3 Weeks*	6 Months*	1 Year*	NA	NA	NA
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	NA	90 Days	120 Days	180 Days	120 Days	6 Months - 1 Year	45 Days

\* = Estimated.

<sup>2</sup>Massachusetts: These numbers are averages and exclude Central Intake processing times.

<sup>3</sup>Massachusetts: Includes automatic reinstatements.

<sup>4</sup>Nevada: Dismissed at correspondence level with no grievance file opened, but some investigation: 30-60 days. Dismissed after grievance file is opened and reviewed by a screening panel: 45-90 days.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	<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.	NA	14 Days	90 Days	9 Months	2 - 6 Months	1 Year	3 Months
North Carolina	NA	NA	213 Days	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Dakota	Yes	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	6 Months	6 Months
Ohio	Yes	4 Weeks	60 - 150 Days	150+ Days	NA	24 Months	6 Months for hearing
Oklahoma	NA	15 - 20 Days <sup>5</sup>	120 Days <sup>5</sup>	150 Days <sup>5</sup>	130 Days <sup>5</sup>	12 Months	9 Months <sup>5</sup>
Oregon	Yes	14 Days*	150 Days*	260 Days*	NA	22 Months	60 Days - 6 Months <sup>6</sup>
Pennsylvania	Yes	7 Days	52 Days	7 Months*	16.6 Months	27 Months	7 Months
Rhode Island	NA	2 Days*	90 Days*	6 - 8 Months*	8 - 10 Months*	8 - 10 Months*	6 Months*
South Carolina	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	3 - 7 Days	80 Days	120 - 180 Days	150 Days	240 Days	90 Days
Tennessee	NA	1 - 5 Days*	1 Year*	6 Months*	1 Year*	1 - 2 Years*	1 Year*
Texas	Yes	30 Days	90 Days	165 Days	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	NA	< 30 Days*	1 - 3 Months*	3 - 6 Months*	6 - 12 Months*	9 - 12 Months*	4 Months*
Washington	NA	6 Days*	69 Days	333 Days*	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	NA	39 Days	417 Days	NA	706 Days	890 Days	191 Days
Wyoming	NA	14 Days	10 Weeks	3 Months	2 Months	4 Months	2 Months

\* = Estimated.

<sup>5</sup>Oklahoma: Formulated by random sampling.

<sup>6</sup>Oregon: For uncontested matters (reinstatements after inactive status, or after short-term suspension), 60 days. For uncontested matters when applicant has been away from law practice for an extended period or has more extensive disciplinary history, 6 months. For contested matters that are litigated and appealed, average is similar to other discipline cases.

<sup>7</sup>Washington: This number is with investigation.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses	Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)	Source of Funding
Alabama	14,821	875,937	Included	Included	100% Legislative appropriation.
Alaska	2,781	634,277	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Arkansas	8,600	614,805	587,805	27,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees. Fines and costs assessed to attorneys receiving disciplinary sanctions.
California	151,975	42,480,000	31,372,000	7,713,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Colorado	21,320	3,213,575	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Connecticut	33,700	NA	NA	NA	100% Legislative appropriation.
Delaware	2,688	NA	NA	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
District of Columbia	60,640	4,915,987 <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Florida	77,102	9,377,103		Included in 9,377,103	95% Bar Association earmarked dues; 5% cost reimbursement.
Georgia	28,689	1,821,992	1,821,992 (Includes Bar Counsel)	30,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Hawaii	4,573	1,222,995	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Idaho	3,637	555,000	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Illinois	80,041	13,217,000	11,396,161	1,821,153	95.18% Supreme Court assessed fees, 1.29% recovered costs and 3.53% interest earned.
Indiana	15,508	1,672,036	1,629,153	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Iowa	8,269	896,831	815,591	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kansas	10,100	1,500,000	NA	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kentucky	14,960	961,998	Included	Included	100% Bar General Fund.
Louisiana	20,049	3,065,760	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Maine	4,760	864,598	Included	Included	96% Supreme Court assessed fees, 2% MCLE and 2% other miscellaneous expenses.
Maryland	33,000	3,551,136	Included	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.

<sup>1</sup>District of Columbia: \$280,000 represents donated space; balance of \$4,635,987 was 100% funded by bar dues.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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>
Massachusetts	48,927	8,085,007	4,623,797	1,446,225	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Michigan	35,920	4,083,207	3,161,684	921,523	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Minnesota	25,576	2,560,251	Included	Same	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Mississippi	9,711	450,557	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Missouri	28,076	2,440,266	2,185,266	253,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Montana	3,254	337,326	238,500	98,826	91% Bar Association earmarked dues; 9% Supreme Court general budget.
Nebraska	6,188	484,302	NA	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Nevada	6,321	992,120	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
New Hampshire	4,241	889,982	NA	NA	95% Supreme Court assessed fees; 5% Character & Fitness Committee fees.
New Jersey	61,360	8,945,640	5,314,143	1,806,495	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
New Mexico	6,045	736,530	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	76,777	3,847,536	NA	NA	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	13,000	1,257,425	Included	Included	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	13,119	NA	1,769,285	NA	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	19,348	NA	1,695,933	NA	Office is part of the Appellate Division, Second Department's operating budget.
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	9,221	NA	1,079,331	NA	100% Attorney Licensing Fund.
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	13,000	NA	1,825,447	NA	100% Legislative appropriation.
North Carolina	20,651	996,528	292,777	43,645	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
North Dakota	1,866	303,765	NA	NA	51% Bar Association earmarked dues; 49% Legislative appropriation.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2005

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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>
Ohio	36,473	4,523,539	1,946,203	811,225	100% from Attorney Registration fees, then annual budget allocation is approved by the Supreme Court.
Oklahoma	14,206	883,656	Same	NA	General Budget line item -- 19%
Oregon	12,770	2,141,000	1,696,000	40,000*	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Pennsylvania	57,086	7,674,000	Integrated <sup>2</sup>	Integrated	92% Supreme Court assessed fees: assessment to recoup cost of disciplinary sanctions, late payment fees, investments, interest, fees for letters regarding status/disciplinary history.
Rhode Island	4,865	862,211	NA	NA	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
South Carolina <sup>3</sup>	9,600	NA	NA	NA	100% Supreme Court general budget.
South Dakota	2,153	62,000	20,000	42,000	85% budget from non-earmarked dues as needed. 15% comes from state government on contract basis.
Tennessee	17,389	2,006,600	2,000,600	6,000	95% Supreme Court assessed fees, 5% interest earnings and reimbursement of expenses by disciplined attorneys.
Texas	76,760	8,500,000	6,200,000	NA	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Utah	6,584	825,401	NA	NA	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Virginia	25,193	3,805,820	NA	NA	Mandatory Bar dues.
Washington	25,160	3,382,036	3,157,501	65,425	100% Bar Association dues. <sup>4</sup>
West Virginia <sup>5</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	18,023	2,398,000	0	0	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Wyoming	2,060	121,500	98,700	2,600	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.

\* = Estimated.

<sup>2</sup>Pennsylvania: Integrated budget with Disciplinary Board and Office of Disciplinary Counsel budget.

<sup>3</sup>South Carolina did not provide data.

<sup>4</sup>Washington: These are not earmarked.

<sup>5</sup>West Virginia did not provide data.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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			X	250
Alaska	X	X	X	X	540 <sup>1</sup>
Arkansas	X		X	X	100 / 175 <sup>2</sup>
Arizona					315 / 460 <sup>3</sup>
California	X	X	X	X	390 <sup>4</sup>
Colorado	X	X	X	X	50 / 155 / 195 <sup>5</sup>
Connecticut					560
Delaware					110 / 130 / 190 / 300 <sup>6</sup>
District of Columbia	X		X	X	173
Florida	X	X	X	X	265
Georgia	X	X	X	X	218 <sup>7</sup>
Hawaii	X	X	X	X	100 / 160 <sup>8</sup>
Idaho	X	X	X	X	55 / 90 / 140 / 255 / 340 <sup>9</sup>
Illinois	X	X	X	X	0 / 90 / 229 <sup>10</sup>
Indiana	X <sup>11</sup>	X	X	X	105

<sup>1</sup>Alaska: \$540 dues, \$10 Lawyers Fund for Client Protection.

<sup>2</sup>Arkansas: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>3</sup>Arizona: Less than 2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice.

<sup>4</sup>California: Reduction of dues based on income available upon request.

<sup>5</sup>Colorado: Inactive/0-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>6</sup>Delaware: Government or corporate employee/0-5 years in practice/5-10 years in practice/more than 10 years in practice.

<sup>7</sup>Georgia: \$109 for inactive attorneys.

<sup>8</sup>Hawaii: Less than 4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>9</sup>Idaho: 70 years or older/less than 1 year in practice and admitted before 7-1-05 /less than 1 year in practice and admitted after 7-1-05 /1-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>10</sup>Illinois: Less than 1 year in practice/more than 1 but less than 3 years in practice or inactive/more than 3 years in practice. An attorney admitted to the bar for more than 3 years shall pay an annual registration fee of 229.00, 7.00 of which shall be remitted to the Lawyers' Assistance Program Fund (LAP) and 42.00 of which shall be remitted to the Lawyers Trust Fund (IOLTA).

<sup>11</sup>Indiana: Includes transfer of \$194,088 to fund Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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>
Iowa	X	X	X	X	160
Kansas	X	X	X	X	150
Kentucky	X		X	X	110 / 220 / 270 <sup>12</sup>
Louisiana	X	X	X	X	100 / 165 <sup>13</sup>
Maine	X	X	X	X	87 / 192 <sup>14</sup>
Maryland	X		X	X	125
Massachusetts	X		X	X	Active: 20 / 165 / 220 <sup>15</sup> Inactive: 10 / 82 / 110
Michigan	X	X	X	X	315
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	97 / 107 / 218 <sup>16</sup> 84 / 82 / 193
Mississippi	X	X	X	X	70 / 130 / 270 <sup>17</sup>
Missouri	X	X	X	X	135 / 143 / 198 <sup>18</sup>
Montana	X	X	X	X	285
Nebraska	X	X	X	X	220 / 320 <sup>19</sup>
Nevada	X	X	X	X	100 / 200 / 350 <sup>20</sup>

<sup>12</sup>Kentucky: Judges (active/retired)/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>13</sup>Louisiana: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>14</sup>Maine: Less than 2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice.

<sup>15</sup>Massachusetts: More than 50 years in practice/less than 5 years in practice/5-50 years in practice.

<sup>16</sup>Minnesota: Less than 3 years in practice/non-resident and military/more than 3 years in practice and resident. Second line of figures indicates adjustment for low income.

<sup>17</sup>Mississippi: Less than 1 year in practice/less than 3 years in practice/4 or more years in practice.

<sup>18</sup>Missouri: Non-resident/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>19</sup>Nebraska: Less than 5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>20</sup>Nevada: Federal Judiciary members/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice. For a multijurisdiction law practice firm add \$500.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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>
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X	195
New Jersey	X	X	X	X	28 / 157 / 182 <sup>21</sup>
New Mexico	X	X	X	X	315 / 365 <sup>22</sup>
New York 1st. Jud. Dept.	X		X	X	350
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	X	X	X	X	350
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	X	X	X	X	350
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	350
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	X	X	X	X	350
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	X	X	X	X	350
North Carolina	X	X	X	X	200
North Dakota	X	X	X	X	325 / 350 / 380 <sup>23</sup>
Ohio	X	X	X	X	150

<sup>21</sup>New Jersey: Less than 2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/5-49 years in practice.

<sup>22</sup>New Mexico: 1-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>23</sup>North Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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		X	X	137 / 275 <sup>24</sup>
Oregon	X	X	X	X	0 / 115 / 360 / 110 <sup>25</sup>
Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X	175
Rhode Island	X		X	X	425 <sup>26</sup>
South Carolina	X	X	X	X	150 / 220 <sup>27</sup>
South Dakota	X			X	0 / 195 / 315 <sup>28</sup>
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	105
Texas	X	X	X	X	50 / 68 / 148 / 235 <sup>29</sup>
Utah	X	X	X	X	190 / 350 <sup>30</sup>
Vermont					150
Virginia	X	X	X	X	250
Washington	X	X	X	X	195 / 318 / 391 <sup>31</sup>
West Virginia <sup>32</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	133
Wyoming	X		X		137 / 250 <sup>33</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Oklahoma: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>25</sup>Oregon: More than 50 years in practice/15-50 years in practice/less than 2 years in practice/inactive.

<sup>26</sup>Rhode Island: \$225 mandatory bar dues and \$200 annual court registration.

<sup>27</sup>South Carolina: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>28</sup>South Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>29</sup>Texas: Inactive/0-3 years in practice/3-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>30</sup>Utah: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>31</sup>Washington: 1-2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>32</sup>West Virginia did not provide data.

<sup>33</sup>Wyoming: 1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

CHART VIII

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

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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	Board Counsel	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies	% Nonlawyer Members on Adjudicative Bodies
Alabama	1	3	0	0; 1	2	5	0	0	0		0	11; 1	16.0%	
Alaska	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	7		11.0%
Arizona	1	10	5	3.5	4.5	6	0	0	0		0	30	33.0%	
Arkansas	1	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7		28.6%
California	1	8	28	57	41	63	0; 15 <sup>1</sup>	0	0	30	2	230; 15		NA
Colorado	1	2	11	5	1	11	2	0	1		2 <sup>2</sup>	36	33.0%	
Connecticut	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	18	33.0%	
Delaware	1	3	0	0	0	1; 1	0	0; 2 <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	5; 3		33.0%
D.C.	1	9; 1	1	2	0	8; 1	10	0	0	9 <sup>4</sup>	0	41; 2	33.0%	33.0%
Florida	1	32	0	0; 24	10	53; 4	0	5	0		0	101; 28	33.0%	
Georgia	1	7	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	19		
Hawaii	1	4; 2	0	1	2	4	0	0	NA	0	0	12; 2		2.0%
Illinois	1	36.9	2; 1	11.2	13.6	15	0; 4	0	0.5	2.6	0	81.8; 5	30.0%	
Idaho	1	1; 1	0	2	0	2	0; 1	0	0		0	6; 2		33.3%
Indiana	1	0	9; 1	1	0	3	0; 3	0	0	0	0	14; 4		22.0% <sup>5</sup>
Iowa	1	3; 1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7; 1		25.0%
Kansas	1	3	1	2	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	12		0.0%
Kentucky	1	6	0	0	8; 1	1	0; 1	0	0		0	16; 2	33.0%; 19.0% <sup>6</sup>	
Louisiana	1	9	4	4; 1	0	14; 1	0; 1	0	0	0	10; 2	42; 5		33.0%

<sup>1</sup>California: Seasonal -- 20 hours weekly.

<sup>2</sup>Colorado: Computer-Controller.

<sup>3</sup>Delaware: Two part-time auditors paid by Lawyers Fund for Client Protection.

<sup>4</sup>District of Columbia: This number includes 3 Lawyers and 6 Support staff.

<sup>5</sup>Indiana: Not an adjudicative body but a probable cause body.

<sup>6</sup>Kentucky: 33.0% at the Probable Cause Level; 19.0% at the Appellate Level.

CHART VIII

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

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
 ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

STATE	Chief Disciplinary Counsel	Other Disciplinary Counsel	Other Lawyers	Investigators	Local Assistants/ Paralegals	Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.	Law Students/ Clerks	Auditors	Probation Monitors	Board Counsel	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies	% Nonlawyer Members on Adjudicative Bodies
Maine	1	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	9		34.0%
Maryland	1	1	8	6	2	11	0	0	0		0	29		33.3%
Massachusetts	1	18	0	0	17	12; 2	0	0	0	0	0	48; 2		25.0%
Michigan	1	12; 2	NA	3	0	13	0	0	0	2	6	30; 2	0.0%	33.0%
Minnesota	1	8	0	0	4; 1	8; 1	0; 1	0	0	0	0	21; 3		40.0%
Mississippi	1	2	0	0	1; 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4; 1		0.0%
Missouri	1	1	5; 11	0	3	6	0	0	0	1	0; 2	16; 13		33.0%
Montana	1	0	0	1	1	1	0; 1	0	0	0; 2	0	4; 3		36.0%
Nebraska	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	33.3%	
Nevada	1	3	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	10		0.0%
New Hampshire	1	0; 1	3	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	NA; NA	10; 1	0; 38%	33.0%
New Jersey	1	9.5	1.5	22	1	20	0; 1	5	0		3 <sup>8</sup>	63; 1	33.0%	
New Mexico	1	3; 1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0		0; 2 <sup>9</sup>	7; 3		
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	1	21	0	6	5	11	0; 2	1	NA		2 <sup>10</sup>	47; 2		
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	1	8; 2	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	16; 2		25.0%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	1	8	0	1	0	3; 5	0	1	0	NA	0	13; 5		20.0%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	1	0	9	3	0	6; 1	NA	0	0		0	19; 1	0.0%	20.0%

<sup>7</sup>Michigan: This number includes 2 Lawyers and 5 Support staff.

<sup>8</sup>New Jersey: 2 Information Technology and 1 Law Office Administrator.

<sup>9</sup>New Mexico: 1 Contract Attorney and 1 Computer Database.

<sup>10</sup>New York, 1st Judicial Department: 1 Computer Intake and 1 Computer Programmer.

CHART VIII

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

SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2005  
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	Board Counsel	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies	% Nonlawyer Members on Adjudicative Bodies
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	1	5	0	2	0	7	0.5	0	0		0	15.5	14.0%	
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	1	3	4; 1	6	0	7; 1	0; 1	0	0		0	21; 3	14.0%	
North Carolina	1	7; 1	0	10	1	3	0	1	0		6	29; 1	33.0%	
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4		33.3%
Ohio: Disciplinary Counsel's Office	1	7	0	2; 0.33	2	9	0; 0.67	0	0	0	0	22; 1 <sup>11</sup>	14.0% <sup>12</sup>	
Oklahoma	1	4	0	4	0	4	0; 1	0	0	0	0	13; 1		32.0%
Oregon	1	7	0 <sup>12</sup>	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0 <sup>13</sup>	16		33.0%
Pennsylvania	1	1	27	6	0	19	0	4	0	0	0	59	12.5%	
Rhode Island	1	1	2	1	0	3; 1	0	0	0		0	8; 1		33.0%
South Carolina	1	6	NA	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	14		0.0%
South Dakota	0; 1	0; 1	0; 1	0	0	0; 0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0; 3.5	14.0%	0.0%
Tennessee	1	7	1	0	1	8; 1	0	0	0	0	0	18; 1	0.0%	100.0%
Texas	1	29	0	10	28	17	0	0	0		1	86		33.0%
Utah	1	5	0	0	2	2; 1	0	0	0	0	0	10; 1		24.0%
Vermont	1	0	1.5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3.5		33.0%
Virginia	1	11	6; 1	10	3	5	0	0	0		0	36; 1		33.0%
Washington	1	16	0	3	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	34	0.0%	29.0 - 33.0%
West Virginia <sup>14</sup>														
Wisconsin	1	2	2	11; 3	2	5; 1	2	0	0		0	25; 4	35.0%	
Wyoming	0; 1	0	0	0	0; 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0; 2		28.0%

<sup>11</sup>Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel also hires the services of 2 private, part-time field investigators as paid independent contractors, not as Court employees. This number is not included in this chart.

<sup>12</sup>Ohio: The Office of disciplinary Counsel (ODC) is not the hearing nor adjudicative body. ODC receives and evaluates grievances, investigates and prosecutes. ODC forwards cases for formal hearings to another agency within the Supreme court of Ohio, the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline (BoC). Their percentage of non-lawyers is 14%. (4 of 28).

<sup>13</sup>Oregon: Does not include staff in Client Assistance Office (intake). That office has 3 staff lawyers, 2 legal assistants and one clerk.

<sup>14</sup>West Virginia did not provide data.