

2009 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE

David S. Baker
CHAIR
Atlanta, GA

Elizabeth A. Alston
Covington, LA

Karen Gould
Richmond, VA

Leslie W. Jacobs
Cleveland, OH

Mark Johnson
Portland, OR

Alice Neece Mine
Raleigh, NC

Professor John P. Sahl
Akron, OH

Barry Sullivan
Chicago, IL

Robert D. Welden
Seattle, WA

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Jeanne P. Gray, DIRECTOR

Mary M. Devlin, REGULATION COUNSEL

Ellyn S. Rosen, SENIOR COUSEL

Kimley Grant, REGULATION PARALEGAL

2009 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)

Introduction to the 2009 S.O.L.D. Survey Results

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2009 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. All responded to the questionnaire. Medians and averages are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2009 Survey consists of nine charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with explanatory footnotes. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the ABA by the jurisdictions. Where exact figures were not available, estimated figures were provided and noted with an asterisk. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data was not available or applicable.

Questions regarding the Survey should be addressed to Ruth A. Woodruff, Associate Regulation Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, woodrufr@staff.abanet.org.

2009 S.O.L.D. Survey Results

The information contained in the 2009 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems is not intended to constitute a comprehensive overview of each jurisdiction's lawyer discipline system. Where possible, footnotes have been included to address variations in the manner in which jurisdictions function and maintain statistics. If you have any questions regarding a particular jurisdiction's responses to the Survey, please contact the chief disciplinary counsel for that agency. [Click here](#) for contact information for lawyer disciplinary agencies. Numerous resources for research and statistics about lawyers and the legal profession are readily available at the [ABA Market Research Department \(MRD\)](#).

Chart I	Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume
Chart II	Sanctions Imposed
Chart III	Reinstatement / Readmission Statistics
Chart IV	Caseload Statistics
Chart V	Case Processing Times
Chart VI	Budget and Sources of Funding
Chart VII	Annual Registration Dues and Fees in State Disciplinary Systems
Chart VIII	Staffing of Disciplinary Counsel Offices
Chart IX	Staffing of Adjudicative Offices

LAWYER POPULATION AND
AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers with Active License	Number of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	Number of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	Number of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	Number of Complaints Investigated	Number of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	Number of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Alabama	17,715	1,824	1,280	1,176	397	63	84
Alaska	3,006	266	112	227	53	22	6
Arizona	16,914	4,224 ¹	671	1,491	1,762	605	54
Arkansas	8,523	861	179	26	1,249	742	144 ²
California	169,411	20,788 ³	4,146	11,961	7,265	2,183	350
Colorado	23,198	4,169 ⁴	57	3,504	401	173	87
Connecticut	36,908 ⁵	1,143	N/A	167	976	730	246 ²
Delaware	3,123	205	54	N/A	290	234	31
District of Columbia	67,896	1,232	398	665	965 ⁶	567	29
Florida	73,181	10,034 ⁷	314	3,284	6,596	4,495	276
Georgia	31,315	2,100 ⁸	340	1,809	350	131	162 ²
Hawaii	4,772	405	151	88	272	80	10
Idaho	4,253	463	187	289	463	354	13
Illinois	84,777	5,834 ⁹	1,584	1,322	5,551	3,883	226
Indiana	17,187	1,456	778	949	1,285	784	62
Iowa	8,777	651 ¹	213	150 ¹	517	361	44

* = Estimated

¹Arizona: Includes 3,133 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

²Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia: Represents number of cases, not lawyers.

³California: 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.

⁴Colorado: Includes matters handled by central intake.

⁵Connecticut: Because of the way attorneys are counted, this number includes some inactive attorneys, retirees, attorneys on disciplinary suspension and those on administrative suspension for failing to pay the Client Security Fund fee.

⁶District of Columbia: 398 represents the number of cases carried over from 2008. 567 represents new docketed matters during 2009.

⁷Florida: Includes 7,779 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

⁸Georgia: Excludes matters handled by consumer assistance program.

⁹Illinois: Includes 4,029 matters handled by central intake.

LAWYER POPULATION AND
AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers with Active License	Number of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	Number of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	Number of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	Number of Complaints Investigated	Number of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	Number of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Kansas	10,750	885	246	371	246	N/A	7
Kentucky	16,330	1,223 ¹⁰	247	559	982	201 ¹¹	56
Louisiana	20,857	3,165 ¹²	2,540	1,760	3,874	939	106
Maine	5,037	378	126	72	369	195	24
Maryland	34,569	1,885	345	1,532	698	228	63
Massachusetts	53,004	1,001 ¹³	743	56	1,744	726	140
Michigan	38,607	2,810	N/A	1,939	922	N/A	110
Minnesota	23,178	1,206	595	550	1,251	363	9
Mississippi	8,523	568	13	382	14	9	17
Missouri	29,320	2,224 ¹⁴	322	1,479	1,025	450	38
Montana	3,477	356	217	105	258	205	13
Nebraska	6,586	450	122	152	298	230	33
Nevada	6,585	1,828	N/A	182	1,646 ¹⁵	104 ¹⁶	21
New Hampshire	4,809	64	72	131	44	30	17
New Jersey	68,431	1,476	1,022	7,380*	2,498	N/A	233
New Mexico	6,413	572	N/A	516	193	99	24

* = Estimated

¹⁰Kentucky: Includes 797 matters handled by central intake.

¹¹Kentucky: Includes those dismissed or closed with a Private Admonition by the Inquiry Commission.

¹²Louisiana: Includes 1,760 matters handled by central intake.

¹³Massachusetts: Excludes 4,801 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

¹⁴Missouri: Includes matters handled by central intake.

¹⁵Nevada: 1,353 cases were investigated, but no grievance file opened, plus 293 grievance files opened for a combined total of 1,646.

¹⁶Nevada: Of 293 grievance files opened, 104 were dismissed outright or dismissed with letters of caution.

LAWYER POPULATION AND
AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers with Active License	Number of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	Number of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	Number of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	Number of Complaints Investigated	Number of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	Number of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
New York: 1st Judicial Department	84,621	4,181 ¹⁷	1,123	932	3,515	2,146	77
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	14,261	1,194	674	454	585	457	76
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	20,564	2,053 ¹⁸	1,339	1,056	835	605	46
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	15,051	2,010	829	1,059	1,376	253	67
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	44,674	3,073	640	984	2,065	376	1,596
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,407	2,550	523	1,222	1,716	893	71
North Carolina	23,744 *	1,489 ¹⁹	673	610	792	620	45
North Dakota	2,052	151	174	40	119	106	N/A
Ohio	42,684	4,677	N/A	2,553	2,124	N/A	107
Oklahoma	16,438	1,500	211	140	248	140	7
Oregon	14,070	1,626 ²⁰	N/A	753	873	717	156
Pennsylvania	61,124	4,755 ²¹	848	174	5,429	4,030	186
Rhode Island	4,930	433	N/A	99	334	274	9

* = Estimated

¹⁷New York 1st Judicial Dept: Includes 857 lawyers suspended for nonpayment of registration fees.

¹⁸New York 2nd Judicial Dept. 10th Judicial District: Includes 383 matters handled by central intake.

¹⁹North Carolina: Excludes 3,286 complaints handled by consumer assistance program.

²⁰Oregon: Includes 1,415 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

²¹Pennsylvania: Includes 2,914 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

LAWYER POPULATION AND
AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers with Active License	Number of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	Number of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	Number of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	Number of Complaints Investigated	Number of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	Number of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
South Carolina	10,748	1,661 ²²	888	248	1,612	1,214	850*
South Dakota	2,361	66	28	18	94	49	16
Tennessee	19,622	898 ²³	583	396	1,462	411	202
Texas	86,075	7,108 ²⁴	N/A	5,349	1,759	1,228	491
Utah	7,866	1,163 ²⁵	N/A	1,039	1,504	46	17
Vermont	2,200	260 ²⁶	50	102	208	144	16
Virginia	28,240	4,120 ²⁷	984	2,375	2,062	819	N/A
Washington	27,795	1,938 ²⁸	1,043	718	2,078	840	83
West Virginia	6,380	555	325	186	880	289	15
Wisconsin	23,591	2,228 ²⁹	651	1,355	1,524	108	30
Wyoming	2,341	161	24	24	184	116	6
TOTAL*	1,421,619	36,703	28,684	58,630	75,221	34,762	5,502
AVERAGE*	26,326	1,147	610	1,106	1,393	695	110
MEDIAN*	16,384	873	345	559	901	362	46
****Please note the figures in green were reported in error for 2009.***							
TOTAL*	1,482,271	125,596	28,684	66,160	77,832	35,067	6,904
AVERAGE*	26,469	2,243	610	1,203	1,390	674	128
MEDIAN*	16,676	1,466	345	559	944	358	55
***Please note the figures in pink are the revised totals for 2009. Updated August 31, 2011 ***							

* = Estimated

²²South Carolina: Excludes 1,612 matters handled by central intake.

²³Tennessee: Excludes 4,051 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

²⁴Texas: Excludes 43,869 contacts handled by consumer assistance program of which 1,000 cases were resolved without filing grievance.

²⁵Utah: Includes 35 matters handled by central intake.

²⁶Vermont: Excludes 210 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

²⁷Virginia: Includes 3,042 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

²⁸Washington: Includes matters handled by central intake.

²⁹Wisconsin: Includes 2, 879 matters handled by central intake.

CHART II
 SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	Number of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Interimly Suspended (For Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded/Censured	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
Alabama	29	53	5	13	17	21	15	17
Alaska	3	3	1	0	3	0	0	0
Arizona	N/A	151	14	1	30	2	73	54
Arkansas	46	44	4	5	10	0	42	1
California	50	374	69	29	227	116	49	205
Colorado	2	86	6	2	52	17	9	28
Connecticut	N/A	124	2	6	8	5	38	1
Delaware	8	8	1	1	4	0	2	3
District of Columbia	N/A	96	23	7	36	32	17	5
Florida	N/A	361	54	38	145	22	109	30
Georgia	42	57	14	4 ¹	32	0	7	N/A
Hawaii	11	3	1	1	0	0	1	0
Idaho	63	12	1	2	2 ²	1	7	5
Illinois	N/A	137	10	16	73	7	24	14
Indiana	10	71	3	4	52	0	24	13
Iowa	74	56	0	3	9	26	18	0
Kansas	11	44	5	4	18	0	16	1
Kentucky	48	40	7	2	21	6	7	3
Louisiana	9	109	4	31	30	31	15	8
Maine	37 ³	22	1	0	3	1	16	1
Maryland	N/A	63	5	13	18	1	26	N/A
Massachusetts	20	131	22	15	59	21	35	3
Michigan	137	107	16	8	48	8	33	2
Minnesota	129	38	1	4	23	2	6	4

* = Estimated

¹Georgia: Voluntary surrender of license.

²Idaho: Does not include 1 disability inactive and 3 withheld suspensions.

³Maine: Dismissal with warnings are private non-discipline. There is no private discipline in Maine. M.Bar R.7.1(d)(4).

CHART II
SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	Number of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Interimly Suspended (For Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded/Censured	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
Mississippi	7	8	5	3	6	0	8	0
Missouri	N/A	36 ⁴	9	4	5	3	4	12
Montana	29	13	0	0	6	2	3	3
Nebraska	11	22	5	3	9	3	2	4
Nevada	26	16	0	1	4	5	3	4
New Hampshire	N/A	21	1	0	2	2	10	6
New Jersey	N/A	148	14	15	30	25	89 ⁵	N/A
New Mexico	11	15	3	0	11	3	1	6
New York: 1st Judicial Department	105	52	21	4	9	10	8	N/A
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	69	37	3	8	8 ⁶	N/A	2	N/A
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	62	45	14	3	11	14	3	N/A
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	150	28	9	8	10	9	1	N/A
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	109	1,464	14	0	1,423	7	6	4
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	32	33	5	6	9	4	9	N/A

* = Estimated

⁴Missouri: Does not include 94 admonitions. Under Rule 5.31 (d) Admonitions are public only 3 years.

⁵New Jersey: Includes 40 admonitions, 26 public reprimands, and 23 censures.

⁶New York 2nd Judicial Dept 9th Judicial District: Includes definite, interim and indefinite suspensions.

CHART II
SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2009

STATE	Number of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	Number of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Interimly Suspended (For Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded/Censured	Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
North Carolina	119 ⁷	71	5	15	7	1	36	8
North Dakota	12	15	2	0	7	1	6	0
Ohio	N/A	114	8	17	62	15	10	N/A
Oklahoma	20	10	2	5	2	0	1	0
Oregon	N/A	67	1	8	18	3	40	0
Pennsylvania	75	97	13	16	40	24	4	9 ⁸
Rhode Island	10	9	1	2	2	1	2	1
South Carolina	58	31	3	0	14	20	3	N/A
South Dakota	16	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	55	57	10	2	32	12	29	N/A
Texas	68	231	32 ⁹	N/A	127	4 ¹⁰	46	N/A
Utah	13	19	3	1	2	3	11	2
Vermont	4	6	0	0	3	0	3	3
Virginia	83	80	9	17	18	N/A	36	N/A
Washington	N/A	56	9	7	20	14	27	7
West Virginia	N/A	9	2	4	1	1	1	0
Wisconsin	40	40	1	N/A	15	6	24	0
Wyoming	3	3	0	N/A	1	0	1	N/A
TOTAL*	1,760	5,009	441	356	2,824	507	929	458
AVERAGE*	43	91	8	7	52	10	17	11
MEDIAN*	29	44	5	4	13	3	9	3

* = Estimated

⁷North Carolina: 29 admonitions; 90 dismissals with Letters of Caution or Warning. Technically, dismissals with a Letter of Caution or a Letter of Warning are not discipline.

⁸Pennsylvania: Probation is private discipline.

⁹Texas: Does not distinguish between types of disbarment. This number represents total disbarments.

¹⁰Texas: Includes 2 resignations after interim suspension sought.

CHART III
REINSTATEMENT /
READMISSION 2009

STATE	Number of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed	Number Granted After Disbarment	Number Granted After Suspension	Number of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed
Alabama	8	0	3	1
Alaska	2	0	0	0
Arizona	8	0	19	0
Arkansas	6	0	6	1
California	22	4	N/A ¹	7
Colorado	6	1	1	5
Connecticut	3	0	2	2
Delaware	2	0	2	0
District of Columbia	6	1	1	1
Florida	32	0	19	16
Georgia	0	N/A ²	0	1
Hawaii	1	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois	7	1	2	4
Indiana	4	0	3	2
Iowa	8	0	8	0
Kansas	2	0	2	0
Kentucky	17	1	17	1
Louisiana	7	0	2	2
Maine	3	0	0	1
Maryland	14	1	6	7
Massachusetts	15	0	13	6
Michigan	7	0	8	9
Minnesota	17	1	13	2
Mississippi	3	1	0	2
Missouri	84 ³	1	42 ³	3 ³
Montana	0	0	1	0
Nebraska	9	0	8	1
Nevada	4	0	2	0

¹California: Reinstatement proceedings are not conducted for suspended lawyers.

²Georgia: Disbarred lawyers must reapply to Bar Admissions not General Counsel for reinstatement.

³Missouri: Includes petitions related to discipline, fees, and restorations from inactive status.

CHART III
REINSTATEMENT /
READMISSION 2009

STATE	Number of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed	Number Granted After Disbarment	Number Granted After Suspension	Number of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed
New Hampshire	2	0	2	1
New Jersey	N/A	N/A ⁴	16	N/A
New Mexico	2	1	1	1
New York: 1st Judicial Department	21	0	3	9
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	7	2	2	3
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	16	4	6 ⁵	5
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	15	1	8	6
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	10	0	5	5
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	9	0	6	3
North Carolina	6	0	3	2
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	5	N/A ⁴	2 ⁶	2
Oklahoma	14	0	8	5
Oregon	175 ⁶	0 ⁴	12	2 ⁷
Pennsylvania	84	3	11	6
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0
South Carolina	12	0	11	1
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	3	0	5	4
Texas	7	4	N/A	2
Utah	3	0	2	1
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	0	N/A	0
Washington	16	0	9	1
West Virginia	1	0	0	1
Wisconsin	21	5	16	3
Wyoming	2	0	0	0

⁴New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon: Disbarment is permanent.

⁵New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District: 1 attorney reinstated after prior voluntary non-disciplinary resignation.

⁶Ohio: Automatic reinstatements from "term suspensions" and "indefinite suspensions."

⁷Oregon: Not all reinstatements are related to discipline.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS 2009

NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA

STATE	Average Caseload Per Lawyer	Average Number Carried Over from Prior Years	Average Number of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	Average Number of Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Alabama	740	244	496	426
Arizona	160	27	99	180
Arkansas	265	45	215	185
California	106	80	84	34
Colorado	136	21	83	103
Connecticut	72	70	88	52
Delaware	96	18	78	80
District of Columbia	87.7	39.8	47.9	51.54
Florida	349	95	254	258
Georgia	32	25	20	8
Hawaii	41	32	22	16
Idaho	198	119	79	213
Illinois	140	140	830	820
Iowa	149.44	50.57	98.87	99.81
Kansas	77	N/A	77	15
Kentucky	166	66	100	163
Louisiana	390	244	146	142
Maine	135*	57*	119*	133*
Maryland	48	38	50	53
Massachusetts	116.66	49.53	66.73	70.2
Michigan	60	N/A	110	N/A
Minnesota	37	42	40	41
Mississippi	35	10	25	25
Montana	468	217	251	263

* = Estimated

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS 2009

***NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA**

STATE	Average Caseload Per Lawyer	Average Number Carried Over from Prior Years	Average Number of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	Average Number of Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Nebraska	99	41	99	77
New Jersey ¹	29*	45*	38*	38*
New Mexico	120	11	120	100
New York: 1st Judicial Department	167	53	113	157
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	59	83	74	130
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	76	122	187	207
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	618	107	512	513
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	409	70	340	319
North Carolina ²	216	67	149	140
Ohio ³	97	78	149	136
Oklahoma	110	40	100	N/A
Oregon ⁴	40	N/A	75	70
Pennsylvania	209	33	176	174
Rhode Island	83	N/A	N/A	68.2
South Carolina	125*	100*	175*	170*
Tennessee	246	126	127	119
Texas	40	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	251	55	195	195
Vermont	76	25	51	72
Virginia	169	82	87	91
Washington	83 *	29 *	52 *	58 *
West Virginia	200 *	27.25 *	139	135
Wisconsin	49	43	148	149
Wyoming	161	24	161	184

* = Estimated

¹New Jersey: The New Jersey disciplinary system is a hybrid system with volunteer attorneys, public members, full-time attorneys and investigators. Therefore, no definitive statistics can be generated for the system.

²North Carolina: These numbers include 4 staff lawyers who work on discipline part-time and one who only litigates.

³Ohio: For Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) only; does not include staff at the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline (BoCO) or at the 35 Certified Grievance Committees.

⁴Oregon: Excludes caseload for consumer assistance program.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES 2009
NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA

STATE	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 for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Alabama	22 Days	142 Days	120 Days	226 Days	87 Days	137 Days
Alaska	95 Days	768 Days	N/A	638 Days 1	1,932 Days 1	N/A
Arizona	38 Days	171 Days	294 Days	0 Days	462 Days	344 Days
California	49 Days	186 Days	480 Days	N/A	N/A	472 Days
Colorado	1.5 Weeks	34.4 Weeks	39.7 Weeks	56.5 Weeks	64.0 Weeks	12.5 Weeks
Connecticut	14 Days	98 Days	99 Days	N/A	240 Days	9 Months
Delaware	7 - 14 Days	60 Days	120 Days	120 Days	210 Days	180 Days
Georgia	4 Days	Formal Screening 60 Days Formal Investigation 8 Months	10 Months	9 Months	14 Months	3 Months
Hawaii	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	4 Weeks*	6 - 9 Months*	6 - 9 Months*	6 - 9 Months*	12 - 18 Months*	2 Months*
Iowa	2 Days*	4.5 Months*	16.74 Months*	7.5 Months*	23 Months*	3 Months*
Kansas	1 Month	6 Months	7 Months	N/A	2 Years	9 Months
Kentucky	7 Days	62 Days	111 Days	570 Days	849 Days	268 Days
Louisiana	3 Days	400 Days	409 Days	765 Days	1,151 Days	639 Days
Maryland	20 Days	120 Days	9 Months	N/A	24 Months	30 Days
Massachusetts	6 Days	140 Days	440 Days	613 Days	735 Days	267 Days
Michigan	30 - 45 Days*	210 Days*	300 Days*	N/A	N/A	9 Months
Minnesota	12 Days	8 Months	16 Months	13 Months	27 Months	6 Months
Mississippi	90 Days	90 Days	180 Days	90 Days	90 Days	270 Days
Montana	3 Days	6 Months	7 Months	10 Months	12 Months	16 Months

* = Estimated

¹Alaska: Average consists of 638 days for 3 cases by admonition; 1,017 days for 7 cases closed by disbarment; 915 days for 21 cases closed by suspension.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES 2009
NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA

STATE	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 for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Nebraska	1 - 2 Days	45 Days	135 Days	120 - 210 Days	365 - 730 Days	90 Days
Nevada	1 - 4 Weeks*	30 - 60 Days* ² 45 - 90 Days	60 - 120 Days*	60 - 90 Days*	Uncontested 4 - 9 Months* Contested 9 - 12 Months*	60 - 90 Days
New Hampshire	N/A	158 Days	450 Days	N/A	777 Days	N/A
New Jersey	N/A	249 Days	377 Days	N/A	832 Days - Including Days Untriable	1.1 Months
New Mexico	1 Month*	1 Month*	6 Months*	6 Months*	1 Year*	6 Months - 1 Year*
New York: 1st Judicial Department	2 Weeks	3 Months	2 Years	18 Months	2 Years	9 Months
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	1 Week	9 Months - 1 Year	Varies	9 Months - 1 Year	Varies	Varies
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	3 Weeks	6 Months	1 Year	Varies	Varies	Varies
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	2 Weeks*	6 - 9 Months*	10 Months*	8 Months*	12 - 18 Months*	12 - 18 Months*
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	90 Days	120 Days	180 Days	120 Days	6 Months - 1 Year	45 Days
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	14 Days	90 Days	9 Months	2 - 6 Months	1 Year	3 Months
North Carolina	66 Days	148 Days	361 Days	196 Days	270 Days	31 Days
North Dakota	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	6 Months	N/A
Ohio	40 Days	125 Days	371 Days	N/A	626 Days	12 Months
Oklahoma	30 Days	N/A	9 Months	9 Months	18 Months	12 Months
Oregon	7 Days	75 Days	290 Days	N/A	21 Months	60 Days ³
Pennsylvania	6 Days	36 Days	7 Months*	15.2 Months	16.9 Months	5.2 Months ⁴
Rhode Island	2 Days	3 - 4 Months	8 - 10 Months	6 - 9 Months	12 - 14 Months	3 Months
South Carolina	7 Days*	3 Monts*	1 Year*	1 Year*	1 Year if Agreement* 2 Years if Trial*	9 Months
South Dakota	3 - 7 Days	80 Days	120 - 180 Days	150 Days	240 Days	90 Days
Vermont	1 Week*	8 Weeks*	14 Weeks*	6 Months if No Appeal*	18 Months if No Appeal*	N/A
Virginia	9 Days	235 Days	626 Days	492 Days	564 Days	559 Days
Washington	6 Days*	66 Days*	386 Days*	N/A	406 Days*	N/A
West Virginia	2 Days*	9 - 12 Months*	12 - 18 Months*	N/A	2 Years*	1.5 Years*
Wisconsin	47 Days	290 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A	190 Days
Wyoming	7 Days*	45 Days*	60 Days*	60 Days*	90 Days*	90 Days*

* = Estimated

²Nevada: Dismissed at correspondent 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.

³Oregon: 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.

⁴Pennsylvania: Includes from inactive, from discipline and denial of petition for reinstatement.

CHART VI
STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE 2009

STATE	Total Number 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	17,715	866,164	Included	N/A	N/A
Alaska	3,006	742,465	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Arkansas	8,523	771,392	751,392	21,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
California	169,411	52,325,000	38,409,000	9,958,000	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Colorado	23,198	5,328,324	4,863,463	464,861	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Connecticut	36,908	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
Delaware	3,123	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
District of Columbia	67,896	6,863,678	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Florida	73,181	10,612,284	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Georgia	31,315	2,464,359	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Hawaii	4,772	1,463,953	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Idaho	4,253	597,801	558,299	39,502	100% Bar Dues Not Earmarked
Illinois	84,777	14,531,028	13,074,498	822,177	97.49% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; .55% Costs Recovered & 1.96% Interest Earned
Indiana	17,187	1,574,862	1,543,188	31,674	98% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; 2% Supreme Court General Budget
Iowa	8,777	1,208,866	1,023,637	185,229	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Kansas	10,750	1,250,000	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Kentucky	16,330	1,714,000	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Louisiana	20,857	4,980,584	3,080,052	1,900,532	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Maine	5,037	963,925	N/A	N/A	89% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; 11% MCLE Fees & Miscellaneous Revenue
Maryland	34,569	3,236,143	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Massachusetts	53,004	13,829,075	6,230,313	4,245,445	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Michigan	38,607	5,089,947	3,938,495	1,151,452	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Minnesota	23,178	3,010,190	Included	N/A	95% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; 5% Professional Firm Income & Judgments, Client Security Board Income
Mississippi	8,523	525,000	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Missouri	29,320	2,576,531	2,238,605	337,926	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Montana	3,477	529,172	459,000	70,172	87% Bar Association Earmarked Dues; 13% Supreme Court General Budget
Nebraska	6,586	986,502	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Nevada	6,585	1,124,575	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
New Hampshire	4,809	1,124,262	N/A	N/A	81% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; 12% Reserve Funds & 7% Fees from Character & Fitness Committee
New Jersey	68,431	11,251,008	6,712,453	2,120,498	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees

* = Estimated

CHART VI
STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE 2009

STATE	Total Number 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
New Mexico	6,413	960,000	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
New York: 1st Judicial Department	84,621	4,565,364	Included	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	14,261	N/A	2,206,606	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	20,564	N/A	2,407,424	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	15,051	1,600,000	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	44,674	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Attorney Licensing Fund
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,407	2,181,612	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation
North Carolina	23,744 ⁴	2,984,350	2,851,175	133,175	100% Bar Earmarked Dues
North Dakota	2,052	406,815	N/A	N/A	51% Legislative Appropriation; 49% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Ohio	42,684	4,840,770	2,457,366	2,383,371	100% Attorney Registration Fund
Oklahoma	16,438	894,383	882,493	5,198	100% Bar Association Dues
Oregon	14,070	2,539,000	1,927,000 ¹	40,000	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Pennsylvania	61,124	8,879,090	Intergrated ²	Intergrated ²	92% Supreme Court Assessed Fees; 8% Assessment of Recoup Cost of Disciplinary Sanctions, Late Payment Fees, Investments, Interest, Fees for Letters Regarding Status/Disciplinary History
Rhode Island	4,930	1,110,764	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
South Carolina	10,748	1,300,000	Included	N/A	44% Legislative Appropriation; 56% Fees & Surcharges
South Dakota	2,361	60,000	35,000	N/A	85% Budget from Non-Earmarked Dues as Needed; 15% Comes from State Government on Contract Basis
Tennessee	19,622	2,897,000	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Texas	86,075	9,333,978	7,225,865	104,467	100% Bar Association General Fund
Utah	7,866	981,000	Included	Included	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Vermont	2,200	410,947	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Virginia	28,240	4,694,855	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Washington	27,795	4,268,359	4,046,889	221,470	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
West Virginia	6,380	875,173	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Wisconsin	23,591	2,957,100	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues
Wyoming	2,341	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Earmarked Dues

⁴ = Estimated

¹Oregon: \$572,000 Client Assistance Office.

²Pennsylvania: Budget of Disciplinary Board and Office of Disciplinary Counsel budget are intergrated.

ALLOCATION OF DUES FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2009

STATE	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
Alabama	300
Alaska	460 ¹
Arizona	315 / 460 ²
Arkansas	20 / 100 / 200 ³
California	410 ⁴
Colorado	95 / 180 / 225 ⁵
Connecticut	675 ⁶
Delaware	80 / 90 / 110 / 150 ⁷
District of Columbia	126 / 224 ⁸
Florida	265
Georgia	236 ⁹
Hawaii	150 / 250 ¹⁰
Idaho	55 / 90 / 140 / 255 / 340 ¹¹
Illinois	0 / 105 / 289 ¹²
Indiana	115
Iowa	190
Kansas	175

¹Alaska: Plus \$10 for Lawyers Fund for Client Protection.

²Arizona: Less than 2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice.

³Arkansas: 65 years or older/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

⁴California: Reduction of dues based on income available upon request.

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

⁶Connecticut: Occupational tax: \$575; Client Security Fund Fee: \$110.

⁷Delaware: Government or corporate employee/0-5 years in practice/5-10 years in practice/ more than 10 years in practice.

⁸District of Columbia: Inactive membership is available for members who are eligible for membership but do not hold themselves out as licensed to practice in the District of Columbia.

⁹Georgia: \$118 for inactive attorneys.

¹⁰Hawaii: 0-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

¹¹Idaho: 72 years or older/less than 1 year in practice and admitted after 7-1-09/less than 1 year in practice and admitted before 7-1-09/first 3 full years in practice/more than 3 full years in practice.

¹²Illinois: Less than 1 year in practice/more than 1 but less than 3 years in practice or inactive/more than 3 years in practice.

ALLOCATION OF DUES FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2009

STATE	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
Kentucky	220 / 270 ¹³
Louisiana	170 / 235 ¹⁴
Maine	107 / 127 / 232 ¹⁵
Maryland	145
Massachusetts	20 / 220 / 300 ¹⁶
Michigan	315
Minnesota	140 / 317 ¹⁷
Mississippi	100 / 175 / 310 ¹⁸
Missouri	50 / 220 / 250 / 305 ¹⁹
Montana	385
Nebraska	240 / 355 ²⁰
Nevada	100 / 250 / 450 ²¹
New Hampshire	485 / 540 ²²
New Jersey	35 / 175 / 200 ²³
New Mexico	285 / 338 / 390 ²⁴
New York: 1st Judicial Department	350 Binennially
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	350 Binennially
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	350 Binennially
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	350 Binennially
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	350 Binennially

¹³Kentucky: 1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

¹⁴Louisiana: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

¹⁵Maine: More than 50 years in practice/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice plus \$40 Lawyers Fund For Client Protection fee.

¹⁶Massachusetts: More than 50 years in practice/less than 5 years in practice/5-50 years in practice.

¹⁷Minnesota: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

¹⁸Mississippi: Less than 1 year in practice/less than 3 years in practice/4 or more years in practice.

¹⁹Missouri: Inactive/non-resident/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

²⁰Nebraska: Less than 5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

²¹Nevada: Federal Judiciary members/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice. For a multijurisdiction law practice firm add \$500.

²²New Hampshire: Less than 4 years in practice/ more than 4 years in practice.

²³New Jersey: Less than 2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/5-49 years in practice.

²⁴New Mexico: Less than 2 years in practice/2-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

ALLOCATION OF DUES FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2009

STATE	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	350 Biennially
North Carolina	300
North Dakota	325 / 350 / 380 ²⁵
Ohio	350 Biennially ²⁶
Oklahoma	0 / 137.50 / 275 ²⁷
Oregon	0 / 110 / 115 / 403 / 482 ²⁸
Pennsylvania	200
Rhode Island	425 ²⁹
South Carolina	120 / 190 ³⁰
South Dakota	0 / 290 / 415 ³¹
Tennessee	140
Texas	0 / 68 / 148 / 235 ³²
Utah	0 / 190 / 350 ³³
Vermont	200
Virginia	250

²⁵North Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

²⁶Ohio: A \$50 late fee penalty is applied if the registration fee has not been paid by September 1, 2009.

²⁷Oklahoma: 1 year in practice/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

²⁸Oregon: More than 50 years in practice/inactive/15-50 years in practice/less than 2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice and excluding mandatory malpractice premium.

²⁹Rhode Island: \$225 mandatory bar dues and \$200 annual court registration.

³⁰South Carolina: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice plus \$30.00 for civil legal needs of indigents.

³¹South Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

³²Texas: 70 years or older/0-3 years in practice/3-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

³³Utah: More than 50 years in practice/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

ALLOCATION OF DUES FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2009

STATE	Annual Dues/Fees (\$)
Washington	225 / 450 ³⁴
West Virginia	100 / 200 / 250 ³⁵
Wisconsin	273.50 / 472 ³⁶
Wyoming	0 / 187.50 / 192.50 / 305 ³⁷

³⁴Washington: Less than 2 years in practice/ more than 2 years in practice.

³⁵West Virginia: Inactive/0-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

³⁶Wisconsin: 1-2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice.

³⁷Wyoming: Retired/Inactive/less than 5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

CHART VIII
 STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL'S OFFICE 2009

STATE	Chief Disciplinary Counsel	Other Disciplinary Counsel	Other Lawyers	Investigators	Legal Assistants/Paralegals	Secretarial/Clerical Administration	Law Students/Clerks	Auditors	Probation Monitors	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff
Alabama	1	3	0	3	3 ¹	4	0	0	0	0	11
Alaska	1	2	0	1	2	2	0; 1	0	0	0	8; 1
Arizona	1	14	0	2	3.5	10.5	0	1.5	0	0	32.5
Arkansas	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
California	0	6	60	53	34	70	8	0	4	2 ²	237
Colorado	1	2	12	6	0	12	2	0	1	4 ³	40
Connecticut	1	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	9
Delaware	1	2	0	0	1	1	0; 1	0; 1 ⁴	0	0	5; 2
District of Columbia	1	15	0	2	0	10	6	0	0	2 ⁵	36
Florida	1	42 ⁶	0	0; 20	10	52; 5	0	6	2 ⁷	0	113; 25
Georgia	1	7	2	1; 1	4	6	0	0	0	1 ⁸	22; 1
Hawaii	1	4	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	14
Idaho	1	2	0	2	0	2	0; 1	0	0	0	7; 1
Illinois	1	36.9	2; 1	11.2	13.6	15	0; 4	0	0.5	2.6	82.8; 5
Indiana	1	0	10; 1	1	0	3	0; 3	0	0	0	15; 4
Iowa	1	4	0; 3	2; 75	0	2	0	0	0	0	9; 1.05
Kansas	1	3	0	2; 1	2	1	0; 1	0; 1	0	0	9; 3
Kentucky	1	8	0; 1	0	6	8.5	0	0	0	0	23.5; 1
Louisiana	1	11	0	6	0	16; 2	0	1	0	0	35; 2
Maine	1	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	1 ⁹	10
Maryland	1	1	7	6	2	9	0	0	0	2 ¹⁰	28
Massachusetts	1	21	0	2	16	12; 1.25	0	0	0	1 ¹¹	53; 1.25
Michigan	1	12; 2	0	3	1	12	0	0	0	1 ¹²	30; 2
Minnesota	1	1	9	0	5; 1	9	0	0	0	0	25; 1
Mississippi	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Missouri	1	6	3.5	1	2	8	0	0	0	0; 2	21.5; 2
Montana	1	0	0	1	1	1; 1	0; 1	0	0	0	4; 2
Nebraska	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Nevada	1	3	0	0	4 ¹³	3	0	0	0	0	11

; = Part-time

¹Alabama: Same as Investigators.

²California: Management.

³Colorado: Controller, Bookkeeper, Computer Tech.

⁴Delaware: Paid by Lawyers Fund for Client Protection.

⁵District of Columbia: Case Managers.

⁶Florida: Include Consumer Assistance Program Attorneys.

⁷Florida: Include Legal Assistants.

⁸Georgia: Clerk of State Disciplinary Board.

⁹Maine: Executive Director.

¹⁰Maryland: Executive Secretary & Secretary.

¹¹Massachusetts: Technology Specialist.

¹²Michigan: Computer Tech.

¹³Nevada: Same as Investigators.

CHART VIII
STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL'S OFFICE 2009

STATE	Chief Disciplinary Counsel	Other Disciplinary Counsel	Other Lawyers	Investigators	Legal Assistants/Paralegals	Secretarial/Clerical Administration	Law Students/Clerks	Auditors	Probation Monitors	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff
New Hampshire	1	0 ; .08	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	3 ¹⁴	8 ; .08
New Jersey	1	11	0	20	1	22	0	5	0	2 ¹⁵	62
New Mexico	1	2 ; 2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6 ; 2
New York: 1st Judicial Department	1	21 ; 1	0	6	5	12	0	N/A	N/A	2 ¹⁶	48 ; 1
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	1	9	0	1	0	4 ; 4	0	1	0	0	16 ; 4
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	1	2	9	3	0	5 ; 1	Varies	0	0	0	20 ; 1
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/2nd, 11th & 13th Districts	1	8 ; 2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0	0	17 ; 2
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	1	5	0	0	2	7	0.5	0	0	0	15.5
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	1	5	2 ; 1	5	0	6 ; 2	0	0	0	0	19 ; 3
North Carolina	1	10 ; 1	0	7 ; 3 ¹⁷	6	3	0	1	0	6 ¹⁸	34 ; 4
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
Ohio: Disciplinary Counsel's Office	1	9	0	2 ¹⁹ ; .33	2 ; .50	8	0 ; .50	0	0	0	22 ; 1.33
Oklahoma	1	3	1	4	2	2	0 ; 1	0	0	0	13 ; 1
Oregon ²⁰	1	6 ; .50	0	0 ; .60	0	6	0	0	0	0	13 ; 1.1
Pennsylvania	1	1	26	4	0	17 ; 1	0	6 ; 1	0	0	55 ; 2
Rhode Island	1	1	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	9
South Carolina	1	8	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	14
South Dakota	0 ; 1	0 ; 1	0 ; 1	0	0	0 ; 5	0	0	0	0	0 ; 3.5
Tennessee	1	8	1	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	26
Texas	1	32	0	11	29	12	0	0	1	4 ²¹	89
Utah	1	5	0	0	2	2	0 ; 1	0	0	0	10 ; 1
Virginia	1	11	6	10	2	8	0	0	0	0	38
Washington	1	14 ; 2.85	0	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	33 ; 2.85
West Virginia	1	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Wisconsin	1	3	2	12 ; 3	2	7 ; 3	1	0	0	0	28 ; 6
Wyoming	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

; = Part-time

¹⁴New Hampshire: 3 General Counsel.

¹⁵New Jersey: IT Personnel.

¹⁶New York 1st Judicial Dept: 1 LAN Administrator & 1 Computer Analyst.

¹⁷North Carolina: There are 5 Investigators who are also Auditors.

¹⁸North Carolina: Staff in the Attorney/Client Protection Department.

¹⁹Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel also Hires the Services of 2 Private, Part-Time Investigators as Paid Independent Contractors. They are not Included in this Chart.

²⁰Oregon: Does not Include Client Assistance Office (Intake) Staff.

²¹Texas: Administrative Managers.

CHART IX

STATE-BY-STATE ADJUDICATIVE OFFICE 2009
NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA

STATE	Nonlawyer Head of Office	Chief Adjudicative Counsel	Other Adjudicative Counsel	Other Lawyers on Staff	Legal Assistants/Paralegals	Secretarial/Clerical Administration	Law Students/Clerks	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte/Trial Level	% Nonlawyer Members at Appellate/Board Level
Alaska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	25.0%
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	33.0%
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.6%	N/A
California	N/A	1	1	8	13	10	0	11 1	44	0.0%	0.0%
Colorado	0	1	0	1 ; 1	0	1	0	0	3 ; 1	33.0%	0.0%
Connecticut	0	1	2	5	0	7	1 2	2 3	17	33.3%	33.3%
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3%	33.3%
District of Columbia	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	9 ⁴	16	33.0%	22.0%
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	28.0%
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0 ; 1	0	0	0 ; 1	33.3%	33.3%
Illinois	1	0 ; 1	2	0 ; 7	0	1	0 ; 3	3	7 ; 11	30.0%	0.0%
Indiana	0	0	0	0 ; 1	0	0	0	0	0 ; 1	N/A	N/A
Iowa	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	20.0%	N/A
Kansas	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	0.0%	0.0%
Kentucky	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.0%
Louisiana	1	0	3	0	3	12 ; 1	0	0	19 ; 1	33.0%	33.0%
Maryland	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	N/A
Massachusetts	1	1	4	0	0	5	0	8 5	19	33.3%	33.3%
Michigan	0	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	7	0.0%	33.3%
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39.0%	0.0%
Missouri	0	0	0	1 ; 1	0	1	0	0	2 ; 1	33.0%	25.0%
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	1 ; 1	0	0	1 ; 1	36.0%	N/A

; = Part-time

¹California: 8 State Bar Judges; 3 Management.

²Connecticut: Unpaid.

³Connecticut: Auditors/Accountants for Random Audits.

⁴District of Columbia: Case Manager and Assistant Case Manager.

⁵Massachusetts: 3 IT, 4 Registration Staff and 1 Bookkeeper.

CHART IX

STATE-BY-STATE ADJUDICATIVE OFFICE 2009
NOT ALL JURISDICTIONS MAINTAIN THIS DATA

STATE	Nonlawyer Head of Office	Chief Adjudicative Counsel	Other Adjudicative Counsel	Other Lawyers on Staff	Legal Assistants/Paralegals	Secretarial/Clerical Administration	Law Students/Clerks	Other Staff	Total Paid Staff	% Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte/Trial Level	% Nonlawyer Members at Appellate/Board Level
New Jersey	N/A	1	1	5	3	4	0	26	16	22.0%	33.3%
New Mexico	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3%	33.3%
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/9th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	0.0%
New York: 2nd Judicial Department/10th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	0.0%
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	0.0%
New York: 4th Judicial Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	0.0%
North Carolina	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.0%	N/A
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3%	N/A
Ohio: Board of Commissioners	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	5	33.3%	14.3%
Oklahoma	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	0.0%
Oregon	0	0	0	0 ; .057	0	0 ; .25	0	0	0 ; .30	33.0%	0.0%
Pennsylvania	1	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	11	0.0%	14.0%
South Carolina	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	18	4	33.3%	N/A
Texas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	0.0%
Utah	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24.0%	0.0%
Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30.0%	20.0%
Washington	0	0.5	0	0	0.15	1	0	0	1.65	0.0%	28.0%
West Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	0.0%
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.6%	0.0%

; = Part-time

⁶New Jersey: IT Analyst & Technical Assistant.

⁷Oregon: Normal Assistance Provided by Bar's General Counsel.

⁸South Carolina: Court Reporter.

**American Bar Association
Center for Professional Responsibility**

**SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS
2009 DATA**

Jurisdiction: _____

Person Reporting: _____

Title: _____

Telephone: _____

E-Mail Address: _____

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. Your timely responses are especially appreciated. 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. If you have any questions regarding your response, please contact Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel at rosene@staff.abanet.org as soon as possible.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY May 1, 2010 TO:

Kimley Grant

grantk@staff.abanet.org American Bar Association

Center for Professional Responsibility

321 North Clark Street, 15th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60654-7598

PH: 312-988-5319

FAX: 312-988-5491 or 312-988-5280

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

We are no longer publishing print versions of the Survey. The Survey is published electronically on the Center for Professional Responsibility's web site at <http://www.abanet.org/cpr/discipline/sold/home.html> . We will start posting available data for the 2009 Survey on June 1, 2010. We will post the data of those jurisdictions that have responded to the Survey Questionnaire after June 1st as it is received.

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 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: _____

Name of Chief Adjudicative Counsel or Non-Lawyer Head of Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

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.

Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System:

The adjudicative office of the disciplinary system is comprised of the professional lawyer and non-lawyer staff, as defined below that supports the system's adjudicators in the performance of their duties, including administrative functions. For purposes of this survey, the actual adjudicators are excluded from this definition of the adjudicative office. The adjudicative office may operate from a different location than the investigative/prosecutorial branch of the disciplinary agency, or it may be located within the same office space but separated physically. For purposes of this survey, location of the adjudicative office is not relevant. Examples of names of the adjudicative office include the Lawyer/Attorney Disciplinary Board, Disciplinary Review Board, Board of Disciplinary Appeals, Board of Professional Responsibility or Commission.

Adjudicative Counsel:

Lawyers employed by the disciplinary agency to work for the adjudicative branch of the system (excluding counsel to the jurisdiction's highest court). These lawyers do not perform investigative or prosecutorial functions. They are responsible for assisting discipline system adjudicators, including Hearing Committee/Panel and Appellate Board members. Their duties include conducting legal research, assisting adjudicators with trial and oral argument preparation, and preparing draft reports and recommendations after hearings or appeals based upon charges (see definition below). The Chief Adjudicative Counsel may also be referred to as the Executive Director, Counsel or General Counsel of the disciplinary board.

Adjudicative Staff:

All non-lawyer staff in the adjudicative office of the disciplinary agency (excluding staff of the jurisdiction's highest court). In some jurisdictions the head of the adjudicative office is not a lawyer and may be referred to as the Executive Director or Administrator of the disciplinary board.

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, a telephone or 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.

Charges:

Any document, pleading or notice filed by the disciplinary agency, or appropriate authority, with the designated adjudicatory tribunal, wherein a lawyer is charged with specified acts of misconduct and a disciplinary sanction is sought, after a determination has been made that there is probable cause to believe that misconduct occurred.

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 2009 or for your fiscal year 2009. 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.

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 indicate estimates by adding an asterisk to that response.

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 to provide standardized data for national comparisons. 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. We will attempt to include explanatory footnotes to the extent possible.

A. LAWYER POPULATION

1. Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with **active** licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the **2009** 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 **2009** calendar/fiscal year: _____
 - a. Does your jurisdiction have a central intake or other consumer assistance program?

 - b. If yes, does the number of complaints received by the agency include matters handled by such a program? _____
 - c. If the total number of complaints received by the agency **does not include** matters handled by central intake or other consumer assistance program, how many matters were handled separately by the program? _____
 - d. If the total number of complaints received by the agency **includes** matters handled by central intake or other consumer assistance program, how many matters were handled by the program? _____

3. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency prior to the **2009** calendar/fiscal year that were still pending on the first day of the **2009** calendar/fiscal year:

4. Total number of complaints that were screened out or dismissed without investigation during the **2009** 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 **2009** calendar/fiscal year):

5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the **2009** calendar/fiscal year. (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the **2009** 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 **2009** calendar/fiscal year after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant charges(as defined in Terms and Phrases).

7. Total number of lawyers against whom charges (as defined in Terms and Phrases) were brought/initiated after a determination of probable cause in calendar/fiscal year **2009**:

C. SANCTIONS IMPOSED

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 **2009**:

9. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year **2009**:

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

a. Who received involuntary/adjudicated disbarments:

b. Who were disbarred on consent (including resignations as defined in the Terms & Phrases):

c. Who were suspended (**excluding** interim suspensions):

d. Who were intermily suspended (for risk of harm, criminal conviction or other reason):

e. Who were publicly admonished, reprimanded, and censured:

f. Who were placed on probation (including probation imposed with other sanctions):

D. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION STATISTICS

11. Total number of lawyers who sought reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law during calendar/fiscal year **2009**: _____
12. Total number of lawyers who were reinstated/readmitted in calendar/fiscal year **2009** after:
- a. Disbarment (any type as defined in the Terms & Phrases): _____
 - b. Suspension: _____
13. Total number of lawyers whose requests for reinstatement/readmission were denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during calendar/fiscal year **2009**:

PART II. CASE LOAD STATISTICS

A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

14. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2009**? (Caseload or cases means the number of investigations and charges).

15. What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into calendar/fiscal year **2009** from previous years?

16. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2009**?

17. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year **2009**?

B. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Please indicate estimates by asterisks:

In 2009, What was:

18. 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?

19. The average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to closure or dismissal if no charges are filed?

20. The average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to the filing of charges?

21. The average time to process a complaint from the receipt of the complaint to the imposition of:

Private/non-public sanction: _____

Public sanction: _____

22. 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. 2009 BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING

23. Total budget for the lawyer discipline system (disciplinary counsel's office and the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system) (see Terms and Phrases) in the **2009** calendar/fiscal year: \$_____

24. Of the amount in response to Question 24, the total budget for disciplinary counsel's office:

\$_____

25. Of the amount in response to Question 24, the total budget for the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system (see Terms and Phrases):

\$_____

26. 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. ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES & FEES

Please respond to the following for your calendar/fiscal year **2009**.

27. 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) \$ _____

_____ (years in practice) \$ _____

_____ (years in practice) \$ _____

_____ (years in practice) \$ _____

PART IV. STAFFING OF THE DISCIPLINARY AGENCY

Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for 2009 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.

A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

	<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. TOTAL number of paid disciplinary counsel's office staff: (should be the sum of 1 through 10)	_____	_____

B. ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

	<u>Full Time</u>	<u>Part Time</u>
1. Non-Lawyer Head of Office	_____	_____
2. Chief Adjudicative Counsel:	_____	_____
3. Other Adjudicative Counsel:	_____	_____
4. Other lawyers on staff:	_____	_____
5. Legal assistants/paralegals:	_____	_____
6. Secretarial/clerical/administrative personnel:	_____	_____
7. Law students/clerks:	_____	_____
8. Other staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)	_____	_____
8. TOTAL number of paid staff for Disciplinary Board (should be the sum of 1 through 7):	_____	_____
9. What is the percentage of nonlawyers serving as adjudicators at the:		
a. Hearing Committee/trial level:	_____	
b. Appellate/Board level:	_____	