

# **2010 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)**



**American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
Standing Committee on Professional Discipline**

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE**

**Myles V. Lynk**  
CHAIR  
Tempe, AZ

**David S. Baker**  
Atlanta, GA

**Joseph B. Bluemel**  
Kemmerer, WY

**Linda A. Gosnell**  
Lexington, KY

**James A. Kawachika**  
Honolulu, HI

**Amy Lin Meyerson**  
Weston, CT

**Cleaveland D. Miller**  
Baltimore, MD

**Alice Neece Mine**  
Raleigh, NC

**Robert D. Welden**  
Seattle, WA

**James S. Hill**  
Liaison, ABA Board of Governors  
Bismarck, ND

**Betty Smith Adams**  
Liaison, ABA General Practice, Solo & Small Firm  
Glenelg, MD

**Kim D. Ringler**  
Liaison, Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers  
Hackensack, NJ

**Sara Rittman**  
Liaison, National Organization of Bar Counsel  
Jefferson City, MO

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

**Jeanne P. Gray, ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**Ellyn S. Rosen, REGULATION COUNSEL**

**Theresa M. Gronkiewicz, DEPUTY REGULATION COUNSEL**

**Kimley Grant, PARALEGAL**

# 2010 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)

## Introduction to the 2010 S.O.L.D. Survey Results

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2010 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. Fifty-two agencies responded to the questionnaire. Kansas, Nevada, New York: 1<sup>st</sup> Department and New York: 3<sup>rd</sup> Department did not respond to the survey. Also, Michigan's Attorney Grievance Commission was unable to respond due to technological issues. Medians and averages are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2010 Survey consists of nine charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with explanatory footnotes. Responses correspond to the questions as numbered on the questionnaire appended to the end of the document. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the American Bar Association 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 Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, [Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org](mailto:Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org).

## 2010 S.O.L.D. Survey Results

The information contained in the 2010 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, Parts A & B
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, Parts A & B
Chart IX	Staffing of Adjudicative Offices, Parts A & B

CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART A

Jurisdiction	Number of Active License Lawyers with	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2b. Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency Includes those Handled by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program	2c. # of Complaints Handled ONLY by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program	2d. # of Complaints Received by Discipline Agency Includes those Handled by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program
Alabama	16,616	1,505	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	2,990	258	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona	15,442	3,871	Yes	Yes	N/A	2,869
Arkansas	8,676	888	No	No	N/A	N/A
California	172,483	21,539	Yes	Yes	N/A	21,539
Colorado	23,762	4,089	Yes	Yes	N/A	4,089
Connecticut	37,473	1,057	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delaware	3,123	233	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	69,546	1,139	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida	91,491	9,285	Yes	Yes	N/A	7,900
Georgia	32,594	2,059	Yes	No	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	4,724	347	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	4,566	453	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Illinois	86,657	5,617	Yes	Yes	N/A	4,008
Indiana	17,187	1,542	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	8,981	615	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	16,712	1,075	Yes	Yes	N/A	632
Louisiana	20,977	3,246	Yes	Yes	0	3,246
Maine	5,129	369	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maryland	34,506	2,003	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	54,326	854	Yes	No	4,724	N/A
Michigan	41,133	2,803	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	23,444	1,365	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	8,683	563	Yes	No	N/A	N/A
Missouri	34,228	2,278	Yes	Yes	N/A	2,278
Montana	3,586	386	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART A

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Active License Lawyers with</b>	<b>2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</b>	<b>2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2b. Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency Includes those Handled Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2c. # of Complaints Handled ONLY by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2d. # of Complaints Received by Discipline Agency Includes those Handled by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program</b>
Nebraska	6,591	429	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	4,752	83	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	69,905	1,431	No	No	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	6,426	620	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	14,667	1,687	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	20,979	2,569	Yes	Yes	N/A	487
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	15,743	2,222	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,641	2,212	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	24,387	1,416	Yes	No	3,314	N/A
North Dakota	2,139	174	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ohio	43,857	4,639	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	16,712	1,497	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oregon	14,412	1,509	Yes	Yes	N/A	1,323
Pennsylvania	62,199	4,728	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	4,992	477		N/A	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	10,000	1,442	No	N/A	1,442	N/A
South Dakota	2,438	75	Yes	Yes	0	0
Tennessee	20,891	3,502	Yes	No	3,576	N/A
Texas	85,813	7,233	Yes	No	734	N/A
Utah	8,226	1,085	Yes	Yes	N/A	29
Vermont	2,000	264	Yes	No	N/A	N/A

CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART A

Jurisdiction	Number of Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2b. Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency Includes those Handled by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program	2c. # of Complaints Handled ONLY by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program	2d. # of Complaints Received by Discipline Agency Includes those Handled by Central Intake / Consumer Assistance Program
Virginia	29,621	3,894	Yes	Yes	N/A	2,888
Washington	28,416	2,487	Yes	Yes	N/A	2,487
West Virginia	6,469	517	No	No	N/A	N/A
Wisconsin	23,827	2,307	Yes	Yes	N/A	3,053
Wyoming	2,390	116	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,380,528</b>	<b>118,054</b>			<b>13,790</b>	<b>56,828</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>26,549</b>	<b>2,270</b>			<b>1,970</b>	<b>3,789</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>16,664</b>	<b>1,437</b>			<b>1,442</b>	<b>2,869</b>

**CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART A**

<b>CHART I NOTES: PART A</b>	
Arizona	Q2: Includes 2,869 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
California	Q2: 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.
Colorado	Q2: Includes matters handled by central intake.
Connecticut	Q1 Because of the way lawyers are counted, this number includes some inactive lawyers, retirees, lawyers on disciplinary suspension and those on administrative suspension for failing to pay the Client Security Fund fee.
Florida	Q2: Includes 7,900 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Georgia	Q2: Excludes matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Illinois	Q2: Includes 4,008 matters handled by central intake.
Iowa	Q4: Represents an estimate.
Kentucky	Q2: Includes 632 matters handled by central intake. Q6 Includes those dismissed or closed with a Private Admonition by the Inquiry Commission.
Louisiana	Q2: Includes matters handled by central intake.
Massachusetts	Q2: Excludes 4,724 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Missouri	Q2: Includes matters handled by central intake.
New York: 2nd Dept./10th District	Q2: Includes 487 matters handled by central intake.
North Carolina	Q2: Excludes 3,314 complaints handled by consumer assistance program.
Oregon	Q2: Includes 1,323 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
South Carolina	Q2: Excludes 1,442 matters handled by central intake.
Tennessee	Q2: Excludes 3,576 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Texas	Q2: Excludes 734 complaints handled by consumer assistance program.
Utah	Q2: Includes 29 matters handled by central intake. Information not available for Q3.
Vermont	Q2: Excludes matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Virginia	Q2: Includes 2,888 matters handled by consumer assistance program.
Washington	Q2: Includes 2,487 matters handled by central intake.
Wisconsin	Q2: Includes 3,053 matters handled by central intake.

CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Alabama	276	1,083	462	332	46
Alaska	98	229	47	24	8
Arizona	619	1,543	1,393	662	48
Arkansas	219	N/A	800	845	119
California	8,759	18,947	9,391	3,261	508
Colorado	87	3,668	407	157	175
Connecticut	N/A	143	879	678	236
Delaware	49	N/A	181	163	18
District of Columbia	395	603	931	367	54
Florida	848	3,939	5,961	N/A	N/A
Georgia	394	1,813	284	81	167
Hawaii	170	258	295	107	11
Idaho	261	0	526	387	14
Illinois	1,867	1,355	5,626	N/A	111
Indiana	724	906	1,360	646	40
Iowa	223	150	688	451	38
Kentucky	363	348	1,040	213	45
Louisiana	2,201	1,913	3,880	1,158	136
Maine	114	177	368	346	27
Maryland	322	1,597	728	222	76
Massachusetts	671	27	1,525	590	146
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	134
Minnesota	571	554	1,384	373	22
Mississippi	9	438	42	6	37
Missouri	390	1,332	1,260	581	35
Montana	208	130	280	195	13



CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Nebraska	74	151	278	237	30
New Hampshire	62	137	83	43	11
New Jersey	1,058	7,155	1,507	N/A	240
New Mexico	174	447	682	624	32
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	596	505	655	535	120
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	1,150	1,059	1,005	652	47
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	786	1,083	1,468	210	35
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	677	1,142	1,616	852	69
North Carolina	776	642	666	485	54
North Dakota	123	61	116	98	N/A
Ohio	N/A	2,381	2,258	N/A	93
Oklahoma	361	N/A	648	226	16
Oregon	N/A	694	815	709	106
Pennsylvania	900	166	5,462	3,833	227
Rhode Island	N/A	126	351	234	6
South Carolina	937	184	2,379	184	1,258
South Dakota	22	65	97	25	15
Tennessee	463	591	3,965	861	126
Texas	N/A	5,000	1,970	1,553	315
Utah	N/A	927	1,428	65	19
Vermont	58	90	232	140	11

CHART I: LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Virginia	964	2,246	1,970	764	N/A
Washington	903	958	2,242	808	102
West Virginia	109	187	629	312	11
Wisconsin	746	1,433	843	145	22
Wyoming	21	84	137	126	12
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30,798</b>	<b>68,667</b>	<b>73,240</b>	<b>25,566</b>	<b>5,241</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>1,431</b>	<b>1,436</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>CHART I NOTES: PART B</b>					
Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia	Q7: Represents number of cases, not lawyers.				
Iowa	Q4: Represents an estimate.				

CHART II: SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2010

Jurisdiction	8. Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	8a. # of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	9. # of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	10a. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	10b. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	10c. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	10d. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended Interimly (for Risk of Criminal Conviction)	10e. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded / Censured	10f. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
Alabama	No	N/A	78	15	5	12	13	58	8
Alaska	Yes	3	5	2	0	3	0	0	0
Arizona	No	N/A	104	2	5	23	5	59	37
Arkansas	Yes	26	44	1	3	10	2	34	1
California	Yes	37	469	90	16	309	161	54	283
Colorado	Yes	5	80	7	2	56	17	15	29
Connecticut	No	N/A	105	4	5	13	5	N/A	N/A
Delaware	Yes	4	10	0	1	5	1	3	2
District of Columbia	No	N/A	115	28	2	35	58	25	3
Florida	No	N/A	399	53	32	142	50	84	76
Georgia	Yes	67	83	33	N/A	42	N/A	8	N/A
Hawaii	Yes	11	3	1	1	0	0	1	0
Idaho	Yes	21	15	0	3	2	3	6	3
Illinois	No	N/A	155	27	14	74	11	25	15
Indiana	Yes	40	49	1	5	41	2	7	N/A
Iowa	No	74	49	1	2	9	15	22	0
Kentucky	Yes	35	43	3	4	28	6	5	11
Louisiana	Yes	17	120	0	0	44	17	28	23
Maine	No	N/A	N/A	0	1	8	0	11	0
Maryland	No	N/A	76	15	13	13	0	35	0
Massachusetts	Yes	18	119	18	17	45	16	39	5
Michigan	Yes	N/A	103	14	8	44	17	36	0
Minnesota	Yes	141	33	3	4	9	1	3	13
Mississippi	Yes	11	21	8	0	9	0	4	0
Missouri	N/A	N/A	40	15	6	4	9	4	5
Montana	Yes	16	11	3	0	3	2	3	1
Nebraska	Yes	18	12	3	3	5	0	1	0
New Hampshire	No	N/A	20	5	0	2	3	6	4

CHART II: SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2010

Jurisdiction	8. Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	8a. # of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	9. # of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	10a. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	10b. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	10c. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	10d. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	10e. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded / Censured	10f. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
New Jersey	No	N/A	136	15	12	21	22	88	N/A
New Mexico	Yes	19	14	3	1	9	N/A	2	5
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	Yes	54	40	11	8	14	N/A	1	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	Yes	59	48	21	3	9	9	6	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	Yes	125	36	11	9	9	7	0	N/A
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	Yes	20	25	8	3	2	4	8	0
North Carolina	Yes	98	86	9	14	11	3	34	15
North Dakota	Yes	9	10	1	N/A	6	1	3	5
Ohio	No	N/A	126	5	17	77	21	11	N/A
Oklahoma	Yes	26	10	0	4	3	1	2	0
Oregon	No	N/A	84	2	7	23	2	50	5
Pennsylvania	Yes	63	98	19	26	34	14	1	4
Rhode Island	Yes	8	9	0	3	2	1	1	2
South Carolina	Yes	208	128	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	0
South Dakota	Yes	19	5	0	3	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	Yes	84	106	13	2	30	5	33	N/A
Texas	Yes	120	195	N/A	N/A	111	3	37	N/A
Utah	Yes	12	25	0	1	6	1	13	2
Vermont	Yes	4	4	0	0	1	1	2	0
Virginia	Yes	79	94	8	13	21	N/A	52	N/A
Washington	No	N/A	85	17	9	24	11	43	6
West Virginia	No	N/A	16	4	1	5	4	2	N/A
Wisconsin	Yes	17	46	4	2	18	10	22	N/A
Wyoming	Yes	9	4	0	N/A	2	0	4	0

CHART II: SANCTIONS IMPOSED 2010

TOTALS	8. Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	8a. # of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned	9. # of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned	10a. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	10b. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	Sanctions: Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	Sanctions: Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or	10e. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Reprimanded / Censured	10f. Public Sanctions: Lawyers Placed on Probation
<b>2010 TOTAL</b>	<b>YES = ( 73%)</b>	<b>1,574</b>	<b>3,791</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>1,428</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>991</b>	<b>563</b>
<b>2010 AVERAGE</b>	<b>NO = ( 27%)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2010 MEDIAN</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2009 TOTAL</b>		<b>1,760</b>	<b>5,009</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>2,824</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>458</b>
<b>2009 AVERAGE</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2009 MEDIAN</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
Georgia	Q8a: Measured in cases not lawyers.								
Maine	Q10b: 1 Reciprocal.								
New York: 2nd Dept/9th District	Q10c: Includes definite, interim and indefinite suspensions.								
Oregon	Q10f: Included in suspension #.								
Pennsylvania	Q10f: Probation is private discipline.								

CHART III: REINSTATEMENT / READMISSION STATISTICS 2010

Jurisdiction	11. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	12a. # Granted After Disbarment	12b. # Granted After Suspension	13. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Denied / Dismissed
Alabama	9	2	5	2
Alaska	1	0	2	1
Arizona	13	0	8	0
Arkansas	16	0	2	1
California	9	1	N/A	4
Colorado	12	0	5	3
Connecticut	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delaware	6	0	1	1
District of Columbia	1	0	0	3
Florida	34	2	16	12
Georgia	2	N/A	1	1
Hawaii	1	2	N/A	0
Idaho	1	0	0	0
Illinois	10	0	3	6
Indiana	6	0	3	1
Iowa	7	0	7	0
Kentucky	9	0	6	1
Louisiana	4	0	4	3
Maine	2	1	7	2
Maryland	7	0	0	7
Massachusetts	35	1	22	2
Michigan	8	2	4	5
Minnesota	8	0	6	2
Mississippi	3	1	0	1
Missouri	41	0	19	4
Montana	1	0	1	0
Nebraska	6	0	6	0
New Hampshire	2	0	2	0
New Jersey	N/A	0	12	N/A
New Mexico	1	0	0	1

CHART III: REINSTATEMENT / READMISSION STATISTICS 2010

Jurisdiction	11. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	12a. # Granted After Disbarment	12b. # Granted After Suspension	13. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Denied / Dismissed
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	6	3	1	2
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	10	1	3	5
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	10	2	3	3
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	6	0	5	1
North Carolina	3	0	0	3
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	N/A	0	4	0
Oklahoma	23	0	10	3
Oregon	170	0	20	5
Pennsylvania	131	1	8	11
Rhode Island	1	1	1	0
South Carolina	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	4	1	3	2
Texas	5	1	N/A	3
Utah	3	0	1	0
Vermont	1	0	1	0
Virginia	0	0	N/A	0
Washington	14	1	11	2
West Virginia	2	1	1	0
Wisconsin	19	4	15	3
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

### CHART III: REINSTATEMENT / READMISSION STATISTICS 2010

CHART III NOTES	
California	Q12b: Reinstatement proceedings are not conducted for suspended lawyers.
Georgia	Q12a: Disbarred lawyers must reapply to Bar Admissions not General Counsel for reinstatement.
Missouri	Q12a: Includes petitions related to discipline, fees, and restorations from inactive status.
New Jersey, Ohio, and Oregon	Q12a: Disbarment is permanent.
Ohio	Q12b: Automatic reinstatements from "term suspensions" and "indefinite suspensions."
Oregon	Q11 & Q13: Not all reinstatements are related to discipline. Q12b & Q13: Estimates.



CHART IV: CASELOAD STATISTICS 2010

Jurisdiction	14. Average Caseload Per Lawyer	15. Average # Carried Over from Prior Years	16. Average # of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	17. Average # of Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Alabama	500	462	500	400
Arizona	188	77	109	120
Arkansas	270	54	222	211
California	175	165	236	116
Colorado	142	26	88	97
Connecticut	96	106	95	85
Delaware	41	11	41	27
District of Columbia	66	28	38	26
Florida	338	95	244	266
Georgia	29	19	21	11
Hawaii	47	51	22	26
Idaho	301	105	196	209
Illinois	140	140	830	820
Kentucky	200	67	133	139
Louisiana	428	270	157	194
Maine	110	38	123	131
Maryland	51	46	58	52
Massachusetts	102	45	57	63
Minnesota	42	34	55	43
Mississippi	38	9	28	28
Montana	469	208	261	235
Nebraska	93	25	93	79
New Mexico	160	15	145	146
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	66	65	118	150
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	91	105	234	232
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	385	90	295	305
North Carolina	209	77	132	127
Ohio	115	84	170	151
Oklahoma	75	25	25	N/A

CHART IV: CASELOAD STATISTICS 2010

Jurisdiction	14. Average Caseload Per Lawyer	15. Average # Carried Over from Prior Years	16. Average # of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	17. Average # of Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Oregon ( <i>estimates</i> )	40	N/A	66	80
Pennsylvania	218	36	182	174
Rhode Island	60	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	120	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	10	3	10	6
Tennessee	175	193	270	328
Texas	35	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	238	60	181	178
Vermont	116	29	87	70
Virginia	90	80	81	84
Washington	88	28	57	54
West Virginia	127	25	120	130
Wisconsin	179	40	138	123
Wyoming	116	21	116	112
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>CHART IV NOTES</b>	<b><i>Not All Jurisdictions Maintain This Data</i></b>			
Ohio	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.			
Oregon	Excludes caseload for consumer assistance program.			

CHART V: CASE PROCESSING TIMES 2010

Jurisdiction	18. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	21a. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction	21b. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction	22. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Alabama	90 Days	180 Days	9 Months	6-9 Months	9-12 Months	90 Days
Alaska	77 Days For Cases Not Accepted in 2010	756 Days For Cases Dismissed in 2010	N/A	731 Days For 4 by Admonition	1888 Days For 56 Susp/Disbar	143 Days For 2 Cases Resolved in 2010
Arizona	42 Days	178 Days	290 Days	N/A	Informal = 246.7 Days / Formal = 774 Days	268.6 Days
California	51 Days	189 Days	575 Days	N/A	N/A	309 Days
Colorado	10 Days	24.2 Weeks	38.6 Weeks	54.9 Weeks	61.2 Weeks	14 Weeks
Connecticut	14 Days	96 Days	95 Days	N/A	239 Days	8 Months
Georgia	4 Days	Informal Screening - 60 Days Formal Investigation - 6 Months	8 Months	8 Months	14 Months	3 Months
Hawaii	90 Days	90 Days	90 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	N/A	6-9 Months	6-9 Months	6-9 Months	12-18 Months	2 Months
Illinois	Less Than 60 Days	Less than 90 Days	180 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	4 Days	64 Days	117 Days	247 Days	752 Days	381 Days
Louisiana	3 Days	385 Days	381 Days	538 Days	982 Days	361 Days

CHART V: CASE PROCESSING TIMES 2010

Jurisdiction	18. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	21a. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction	21b. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction	22. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Maryland	20 Days	120 Days	9 Months	N/A	20 Months	60 Days
Massachusetts	Average 5 Days / Median 6 Days	Average 160 Days / Median 99 Days	Average 397 Days / Median 314 Days	Average 497 Days / Median 435 Days	Average 655 Days / Median 640 Days	Average 336 Days / Median 239 Days
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6 Months
Minnesota	1 Month	8 Months	21 Months	11 Months	22 Months	6 Months
Mississippi	90 Days	90 Days	180 Days	90 Days	90 Days	270 Days
Montana	10 Days	8 Months	10 Months	10 Months	15 Months	8 Months
Nebraska	1-2 Days	45 Days	135 Days	120-210 Days	365-730 Days	90 Days
New Hampshire	80 Days	166 Days	335 Days	N/A	730 Days	N/A
New Jersey	N/A	249 Days From Grievance	377 Days (Not Including Remanded Cases)	N/A	832 Days (Including Days Untriable)	1.1 Months
New Mexico	1 Month	1 Month - 3 Months	6 Months	6 Months	N/A	6 - 9 Months
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	1 Week	9 Months to 1 year	Varies	9 Months to 1 year	Varies	Varies
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	3 Weeks	6 Months	1 Year	Varies	Varies	Varies
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	10 Days	4 Months	8 Months	6 Months	12 to 18 Months	12 to 18 Months

CHART V: CASE PROCESSING TIMES 2010

Jurisdiction	18. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	21a. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction	21b. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction	22. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
New York:4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	14 Days	90 Days	9 Months	2-6 Months	1 Year	3 Months
North Carolina	78 Days	192 Days	379 Days	204 Days	298 Day	173 Days
North Dakota	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	3 Months	6 Months	N/A
Ohio	51 Days	109 Days	268 Days	n/a	737 Days	N/A
Oklahoma	30 Days	120 Days	270 Days	6 Months	One Year	6 Months
Oregon	6 Days	88 Days	300 Days	No Private Sanctions in Oregon	21 Months	60 Days to 21 Months Depending on Type of Application
Pennsylvania	7 Calendar Days	35 Calendar Days	7 Months	471 Calendar Days = 15.7 month	571 Calendar Days = 19 Months	48 Calendar Days
Rhode Island	2 Days	3-4 Months	8-10 Months	6-9 Months	12-14 Months	N/A
South Dakota	90 Days	90 Days	120 Days	90 Days	180 Days	90 Days
Texas	30 Days	120 Days	155 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vermont	10 Days	60 Days	90 Days	1 Year	1 Year	4 Months
Virginia	10 Days	239 Days	638 Days	606 Days	674 Days	N/A
Washington	5 Days	59 Days	439 Days	N/A	447 Days	N/A
West Virginia	1-2 Days	6-12 Months	12-18 Months	N/A	2 Years	1.5 Years
Wisconsin	51 Days	293 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A	267 Days
Wyoming	7 Days	45 Days	60 Days	60 Days	90 Days	90 Days
<b>CHART V NOTES</b> <i>Not All Jurisdictions Maintain This Data</i>						

CHART VI: BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING 2010

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	23. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	24. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative / Adjudicative Budget (\$)	26. Source of Funding	26. Other Sources of Funding
Alabama	16,616	N/A	Included	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	2,990	\$787,169	Included	\$0	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Arizona	15,442	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	8,676	\$790,000	\$769,000	\$21,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
California	172,483	\$50,242,000	\$36,257,000	\$9,991,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Colorado	23,762	\$5,509,693	\$4,193,706	\$595,987	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Connecticut	37,473	N/A	N/A	N/A	All of Our Funding Comes From the General Judicial Branch Budget	All of Our Funding Comes From the General Judicial Branch Budget
Delaware	3,123	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	69,546	\$7,072,423	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	602,088 Represents Donated Space by DCCA & 6,470,335 is Funded by Bar Dues
Florida	91,491	\$11,421,753	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Georgia	32,594	\$2,672,973	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Hawaii	4,724	\$1,535,300	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Idaho	4,566	\$597,801	\$558,299	\$39,502	N/A	Bar Dues Not Earmarked 100%

CHART VI: BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING 2010

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	23. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	24. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative / Adjudicative Budget (\$)	26. Source of Funding	26. Other Sources of Funding
Illinois	86,657	\$15,596,614	\$13,484,364	N/A	92.79% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	7.21% Costs Recovered & Interest Earned
Indiana	17,187	\$1,835,452	Included	N/A	98% Supreme Court Assessed Fees / 2% Supreme Court General Budget	N/A
Iowa	8,981	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	16,712	\$1,760,000	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	Nominal Income Also Generated Each Year by the Ethics & Prof. Enhancement Program
Louisiana	20,977	\$5,155,392	\$3,158,115	\$2,006,377	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Maine	5,129	\$992,039	N/A	N/A	89% Bar Association Dues	11% CLE Fees & Miscellaneous Revenue
Maryland	34,506	\$3,110,666	Included	N/A	95% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	5% Bank Interest & Interest on Recovery Costs
Massachusetts	54,326	\$14,517,993	\$6,575,409	\$484,782	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Michigan	41,133	\$4,979,109	\$3,887,636	\$1,091,473	97% Bar Association Dues	3% Pro Hac Vice Fees & Reimbursed Costs

CHART VI: BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING 2010

Jurisdiction:	Number of Lawyers with Active License	23. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	24. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative / Adjudicative Budget (\$)	26. Source of Funding	26. Other Sources of Funding
Minnesota	23,444	\$3,104,707	Included	\$0	95% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	5% Professional Firm Fees, Judgments. Client Security Board Contract Work
Mississippi	8,683	\$540,000	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A
Missouri	34,228	\$2,597,740	\$2,254,406	\$343,334	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Montana	3,586	\$538,211	\$459,000	\$79,211	85% Bar Association Dues / 15% Supreme Court General Budget	N/A
Nebraska	6,591	\$1,274,572	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
New Hampshire	4,752	\$1,104,473	N/A	N/A	85% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8% Committee on Character & Fitness and 7% Self Funding
New Jersey	69,905	\$11,743,234	\$6,966,961	\$2,282,368	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
New Mexico	6,426	\$980,559	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	14,667	\$2,286,987	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	20,979	n/a	\$2,295,582	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	15,743	\$1,600,000	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A



CHART VI: BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING 2010

Jurisdiction:	Number of Lawyers with Active License	23. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	24. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative / Adjudicative Budget (\$)	26. Source of Funding	26. Other Sources of Funding
New York:4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,641	\$2,236,868	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
North Carolina	24,387	\$2,990,692	\$2,857,299	\$133,393	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
North Dakota	2,139	\$406,815	N/A	N/A	49% Bar Association Dues / 51% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
Ohio	43,857	\$5,024,137	\$2,533,882	\$2,490,255	100% All Funds from Attorney Registration Fees, Paid by Attorneys in Active Practice	N/A
Oklahoma	16,712	\$1,200,000	\$1,183,000	N/A	100% Bar Association General Budget	N/A
Oregon	14,412	\$2,539,000	\$1,911,000	\$40,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Pennsylvania	62,199	\$9,872,848	Intergrated	Intergrated	92% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8% Late Payment Fees; Fees to Recoup Discipline Costs; Certification Fees; Interest
Rhode Island	4,992	\$1,071,231	Included	\$0	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
South Carolina	10,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court General Budget	N/A
South Dakota	2,438	\$60,000	Included	\$60,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A

CHART VI: BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING 2010

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	23. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	24. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative / Adjudicative Budget (\$)	26. Source of Funding	26. Other Sources of Funding
Tennessee	20,891	\$3,010,604	Included	N/A	92% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8% Cost Reimbursement & Penalties
Texas	85,813	\$9,481,058	\$7,326,346	\$83,091	100% Other	State Bar Budget Appropriation From the General Fund (Bar is a State Agency)
Utah	8,226	\$980,600	Included	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vermont	2,000	\$410,947	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Virginia	29,621	\$5,080,745	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Washington State	28,416	\$4,347,264	\$4,125,746	\$221,518	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
West Virginia	6,469	\$950,249	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Wisconsin	23,827	\$2,888,700	Included	N/A	93% Bar Association Dues	7% Assessed Costs of Disciplinary Sanctions, Pro Hac Vice Fees, Reinstatement Fees
Wyoming	2,390	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	Board of Professional Responsibility Yearly Budget
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$206,898,618</b>	<b>\$100,796,751</b>	<b>\$19,963,291</b>		
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$4,702,241</b>	<b>\$5,599,820</b>	<b>\$998,165</b>		
<b>MEDIAN</b>		<b>\$2,412,994</b>	<b>\$3,007,707</b>	<b>\$108,242</b>		
<b>CHART VI NOTES</b>						
New York: 2nd Dept/9th District	Total budget for 9th District Only.					
Oregon	Q24: Total budget includes DCO and separate intake office.					
Pennsylvania	Q24 & Q25: Budget of Disciplinary Board and Office of Disciplinary Counsel budget are integrated.					

CHART VII: ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2010

27. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Alabama									\$150 / \$300 Unspecified
Alaska	\$500								Plus \$10 for Lawyers Fund for Client Protection
Arizona		\$315	\$315	\$460	\$460	\$460	\$460		
Arkansas		\$100	\$100	\$100	\$200	\$200	\$200		
California	\$410								Reduction of Dues Based on Income Available Upon Request
Colorado		\$180	\$180	\$180	\$225	\$225	\$225		
Connecticut	\$685								Occupational Tax \$575 Client Security Fund Fee \$110
Delaware		\$90	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$110		More than 10 Years = \$150
District of Columbia	\$237								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
Florida	\$265								
Georgia	\$236							\$118	
Hawaii		\$341	\$341	\$341	\$341	\$341	\$501		
Idaho		\$255	\$255	\$255	\$255	\$340	\$340		Admitted After 7/1 = \$90 / Admitted Before 7/1 = \$140 / 72 years+ = \$55
Illinois		\$0	\$105	\$105	\$289	\$289	\$289	\$105	
Indiana	\$115								
Iowa									
Kentucky			\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$270		
Louisiana		\$170	\$170	\$170	\$235	\$235	\$235		
Maine		\$107	\$107	\$107	\$127	\$127	\$127		Plus \$40 Lawyers Fund for Client Protection Fee
Maryland	\$145								
Massachusetts		\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$300	<5 years = \$110 / 5-50 years = \$150 / 50+ years = \$10	Over 50 Years & Active = \$20
Michigan	\$315								
Minnesota		\$140	\$140	\$140	\$317	\$317	\$317		
Mississippi		\$100	\$100	\$100	\$175	\$175	\$175		
Missouri		\$250	\$250	\$250	\$305	\$305	\$305		
Montana	\$385								

CHART VII: ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS 2010

27. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Nebraska		\$240	\$240	\$240	\$240	\$240	\$355		
New Hampshire		\$485	\$485	\$485	\$485	\$540	\$540		
New Jersey				\$35	\$175	\$175	\$204		5 - 49 Years = \$204
New Mexico			\$340	\$340	\$400	\$400	\$400		
New York: 1st Judicial Department	\$350								Biennially
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	\$350								Biennially
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	\$350								Biennially
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	\$350								Biennially
New York: 3rd Judicial Department	\$350								Biennially
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	\$350								Biennially
North Carolina	\$300								
North Dakota		\$325	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$380		
Ohio	\$175								
Oklahoma		\$138	\$138	\$138	\$138	\$275	\$275		
Oregon		\$413	\$413	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$492	\$110	More than 15 & Pro Bono Only = \$0 / More than 50 Years = \$0
Pennsylvania	\$175								
Rhode Island	\$425								\$225 Mandatory Bar Dues & \$200 Annual Court Registration
South Carolina		\$290	\$290	\$290					
South Dakota		\$290	\$290	\$290	\$290	\$290	\$415		
Tennessee	\$140								
Texas		\$68	\$68	\$68	\$148	\$148	\$235		
Utah			\$250	\$250	\$425	\$425	\$425		
Vermont	\$200								
Virginia	\$250								
Washington		\$225	\$225	\$450	\$450	\$450	\$450		
West Virginia		\$100	\$200	\$200	\$250	\$250	\$250		
Wisconsin			\$271	\$467	\$467	\$467	\$467		
Wyoming	\$305							\$188	Retired/Hon. = \$0 / New Active = \$193

CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART A

Jurisdiction	28a. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		28b. Other Disciplinary Counsel		28c. Other Lawyers		28d. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		28e. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		28f. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alaska	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Arizona	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	31.0	0.0	68.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
Connecticut	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delaware	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
District of Columbia	1.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
Florida	1.0	0.0	45.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	52.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hawaii	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	35.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	2.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Indiana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maryland	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	12.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Mississippi	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Nebraska	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	1.0	N/A	0.0	0.8	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	3.0	N/A	0.0	N/A

CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART A

Jurisdiction	28a. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		28b. Other Disciplinary Counsel		28c. Other Lawyers		28d. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		28e. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		28f. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.0	Varies	0.0
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	1.0	0.0	8.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oklahoma	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Oregon	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Texas	1.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0

CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART A

Jurisdiction	28a. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		28b. Other Disciplinary Counsel		28c. Other Lawyers		28d. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		28e. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		28f. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Vermont	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	1.0	0.0	14.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	8.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
West Virginia	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>356.0</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>152.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>158.0</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>404.5</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>

CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	28g. Auditors		28h. Probation Monitors		28i. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	28. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	11.0	0.0
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	2.0
Arizona	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	Investigators	31.0	0.0
Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1 Investigator. This category was on the 2009 survey but omitted in 2010.	7.0	0.0
California	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	55.0	0.0	2 Management & 53 Investigators	225.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	Controller, Accounting, IT Department	45.0	0.0
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Delaware	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Part-Time Auditor Paid by LFCP	5.0	0.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2 Investigators & 2 Case Managers	36.0	0.0
Florida	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	Q28i = Investigators	116.0	25.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1 Full-Time Investigator & 1 Part-Time Investigator	18.0	1.0
Hawaii	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	Investigators	15.0	0.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	1.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	N/A	78.0	10.0
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Investigator	15.0	4.0
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	23.5	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	6 Investigators	35.0	2.0
Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Executive Director	10.0	0.0
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Executive Secretary & Her Secretary	2.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2 Investigators & 1 Technology Specialist	54.3	0.0
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	25.0	2.0
Mississippi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	N/A	23.5	2.0
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Investigator	4.0	1.0
Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.0	0.0
New Hampshire	1.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	3.0	N/A	General Counsel	8.0	0.8



CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	28g. Auditors		28h. Probation Monitors		28i. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	28. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
New Jersey	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	2 IT Employees & 20 Investigators	62.0	0.0
New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	2.0
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Investigator	16.0	4.0
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	Investigators	21.0	1.0
New York: 2nd Department/11th & 13th Districts	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Investigator	17.0	2.0
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	Investigators	19.0	3.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	3.0	6 Attorney/Client Assistance; 8 Full-Time Investigators & 3 Part-Time Investigators	36.0	4.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.0	0.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2 Part-Time Field Investigators to Supplement 2 Full-Time Staff Investigators	22.0	1.0
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4 Full-Time Investigators	13.0	2.0
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Does Not Include Separate Intake Staff Which Has 3 Lawyers & 2 Clerical	14.0	0.1
Pennsylvania	6.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	Investigators	55.0	1.0
Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2 Confidential Investigators	9.0	0.0
South Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Investigators	14.0	0.0
Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	32.0	0.0
Texas	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	9 Investigators, 4 Administrative/Executive Managers & 1 Docket Administrator	84.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	10.0	0.0

CHART VIII: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction:	28g. Auditors		28h. Probation Monitors		28i. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	28. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	0.8
Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	2.0	Investigators	40.0	2.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	Investigators	32.0	3.9
West Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	0.0
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	5.0	Investigators	24.0	8.0
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>208.0</b>	<b>31.0</b>		<b>1,361.3</b>	<b>85.5</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>		<b>28.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>		<b>15.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>

CHART IX: STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES: 2010 PART A

Jurisdiction	a. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		b. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		c. Other Adjudicative Counsel		d. Other Lawyers on Staff		e. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		f. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		g. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
California	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	2.0
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maryland	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Jersey	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

CHART IX: STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES: 2010 PART A

Jurisdiction	a. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		b. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		c. Other Adjudicative Counsel		d. Other Lawyers on Staff		e. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		f. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		g. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York:4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ohio	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oklahoma	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vermont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
West Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CHART IX NOTES: PART A *Not All Jurisdictions Maintain This Data*

CHART IX: STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	h. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	I. TOTAL Paid Staff		30a. % Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte/Trial Level	30b. % Nonlawyer Members at Appellate / Board Level
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time		
Alabama	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20%	0%
Alaska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19%	25%
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	33%
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28%	N/A
California	11.0	0.0	3 Management & 8 State Bar Judges	44.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Colorado	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.0	2.0	33%	N/A
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	N/A	9.0	6.0	33%	33%
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	33%
District of Columbia	2.0	0.0	2 Case Managers	9.0	2.0	33%	22%
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	27%	17%
Idaho	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0	33%	33%
Illinois	4.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	9.0	30%	0%
Indiana	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	N/A	21.0	1.0	33%	19%
Maine	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0	33%	33%
Maryland	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20%	N/A
Massachusetts	8.0	0.0	3 IT, 4 Registration Staff & 1 Bookkeeper	19.0	0.0	33%	33%
Michigan	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0	0%	33%
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39%	0%
Missouri	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	1.0	33%	25%
Montana	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0	36%	N/A
Nebraska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	33%
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	0.0	34%	25%
New Jersey	6.0	0.0	Chief, Docketing/Appeals/Cost Unit; Systems Coordinator	17.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	17%
New York: 2nd Department/9th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20%	0%

CHART IX: STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES 2010: PART B

Jurisdiction	h. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	I. TOTAL Paid Staff		30a. % Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte/Trial Level	30b. % Nonlawyer Members at Appellate / Board Level
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time		
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Comm. Mem. 20% Form. Hrgs 0%	N/A
New York: 4th Judicial Departments/5th, 7th & 8th Districts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14%	0%
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0	33%	N/A
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	33%
Ohio	0.0	0.0	N/A	5.0	0.0	33%	14%
Oklahoma	N/A	N/A	All Volunteers Under OK System	N/A	N/A	33%	0%
Oregon	0.0	0.0	Nominal Assistance Provided by Bar's General Counsel	0.0	0.3	33%	0%
Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	N/A	9.0	0.5	0%	15%
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	Court reporter	4.0	0.0	20%	N/A
Utah	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	24%	0%
Vermont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A
Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30%	20%
Washington	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.7	0.0	0%	28%
West Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	0%
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	29%	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>		<b>161.7</b>	<b>23.8</b>		
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>		<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>		<b>3.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>

CHART IX NOTES: PART B *Not All Jurisdictions Maintain This Data*

**American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility**

**SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS  
2010 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 Ruth A. Woodruff, Associate Regulation Counsel at [Ruth.Woodruff@americanbar.org](mailto:Ruth.Woodruff@americanbar.org) as soon as possible.**

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY **June 30, 2011** TO:

Kimley Grant  
American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
321 North Clark Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-7598  
PH: (312) 988-5319  
FAX: (312) 988-5491 or (312) 988-5280  
Email: [Kimley.Grant@americanbar.org](mailto:Kimley.Grant@americanbar.org)

\*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.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/standing\\_committee\\_on\\_professional\\_discipline.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/standing_committee_on_professional_discipline.html). We will start posting available data for the 2010 Survey on June 1, 2011. 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.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/standing\\_committee\\_on\\_professional\\_discipline.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/standing_committee_on_professional_discipline.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 2010 or for your fiscal year 2010. 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 Ruth A. Woodruff, Associate Regulation Counsel at [Ruth.Woodruff@americanbar.org](mailto:Ruth.Woodruff@americanbar.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 **2010** 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 **2010** 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 **2010** calendar/fiscal year that were still pending on the first day of the **2010** calendar/fiscal year:

---

4. Total number of complaints that were screened out or dismissed without investigation during the **2010** 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 **2010** calendar/fiscal year):

---

5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the **2010** calendar/fiscal year. (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the **2010** 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 **2010** 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 **2010**:

---

### 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 **2010**:

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year **2010**:

\_\_\_\_\_

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 **2010**: \_\_\_\_\_
12. Total number of lawyers who were reinstated/readmitted in calendar/fiscal year **2010** 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 **2010**:  
\_\_\_\_\_

**PART II. CASE LOAD STATISTICS**

**A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**

14. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2010**? (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 **2010** from previous years?

\_\_\_\_\_

16. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2010**?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year **2010**?

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. CASE PROCESSING TIMES**



Please indicate estimates by asterisks:

In 2010, 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. 2010 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 **2010** calendar/fiscal year: \$\_\_\_\_\_

24. Of the amount in response to Question 23, 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 **2010**.

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 2010 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**

	<b><u>Full Time</u></b>	<b><u>Part Time</u></b>
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 counsel's office staff: (should be the sum of 1 through 10)	_____	_____

**B. ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

	<b><u>Full Time</u></b>	<b><u>Part Time</u></b>
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. <b>TOTAL</b> 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:	_____	