2004 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2004 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. All 56 agencies responded to the questionnaire. Medians and averages of various categories are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2004 Survey consists of eight charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with footnotes if clarification of data is necessary. In some instances exact figures were not available. Therefore, approximate figures were provided. The abbreviation “N/A” means that the data was not available or applicable. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the ABA by the various jurisdictions. Please contact the specific jurisdiction if you have further inquiries. Contact information for lawyer disciplinary agencies is at http://www.abanet.org/cpr/regulation/scep/disciplinary.html. Numerous resources for research and statistics about lawyers and the legal profession are readily available at ABA Market Research Department (MRD).

2004 S.O.L.D. Survey Results

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

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

Person Reporting: _____________________________ Tel.# ________________

Title of Person Reporting: _____________________________________________

INTRODUCTION

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

We appreciate your cooperation in helping us collect this vital data and your timely responses are especially appreciated. Prompt responses to the questionnaire allow us to publish the data in a more timely manner, making it more useful to disciplinary agencies and the public, and reduces the number of follow up inquiries that we have to make. If you have questions regarding the timing of your response due to your fiscal year, please contact Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel at rosene@staff.abanet.org. as soon as the concern arises.

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

A. Please send us any other internal procedural rules utilized by the disciplinary board or hearing committee/officers in disciplinary proceedings.

B. Please send us a copy of your annual report for 2004 and any internal professional responsibility surveys regarding lawyer discipline, complainants or respondents.

C. Please send us any revised complaint forms, brochures and instructional materials describing your system, including any videocassettes.

D. Please tell us about any significant developments in 2004, e.g., the opening of proceedings to the public upon the filing of formal charges, establishment of a central intake system or alternatives to discipline program, etc.
**TERMS AND PHRASES**

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

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

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

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

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

**Misconduct:**
A violation of the applicable rules of professional conduct.

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

**Screened Out/Summarily Dismissed Without Investigation:**
The disposal of a complaint by the disciplinary agency without seeking any information in addition to that which is contained in the initial complaint to the agency, whether or not that complaint is accorded file status or is docketed.
PART II. CASE PROCESSING AND SANCTION STATISTICS

Please fill in the appropriate figures for calendar year 2004 or for your fiscal year ending in the month of __________, 2004. 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 provide explanations of your responses where necessary.

A. LAWYER POPULATION

1. Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with active licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the 2004 calendar/fiscal year:

_________________

B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS

2. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct during the 2004 calendar/fiscal year:

_________________

3. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency prior to the commencement of the 2004 calendar/fiscal year that were still pending on the first day of that calendar/fiscal year:

_________________

4. Total number of complaints that were screened out or dismissed without investigation during the 2004 calendar/fiscal year for lack of jurisdiction, or for not alleging sufficient facts that would, if true, constitute misconduct. (This number may include complaints that were received prior to the commencement of the 2004 calendar/fiscal year.):

_________________
5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the 2004 calendar/fiscal year. (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the 2004 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 2004 calendar/fiscal year after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant formal charges.

_________________

7. In how many of the complaints reported in response to Question 5, was there a determination by the appropriate authority, in calendar/fiscal year 2004 that formal charges of misconduct should be brought/initiated:

_________________

8. Total number of lawyers against whom formal charges were brought/initiated in calendar/fiscal year 2004:

_________________
C. SANCTIONS

9. Total number of lawyers who received private, i.e., non-public, disciplinary sanctions during calendar/fiscal year 2004:

_________________

10. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year 2004:

_________________

11. Of these total public sanctions,
   a. Total involuntary/adjudicated disbarments: ________
   b. Total disbarments on consent (including resignations as defined in the Terms & Phrases): ________
   c. Total suspensions excluding interim suspensions: ________
   d. Total interim suspensions (for risk of harm or for criminal conviction): ________
   e. Total public reprimands/censures: ________
   f. Total probations (including probation imposed with other sanctions): ________
   g. Total transfers to disability-inactive status: ________
D. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

12. Total number of petitions, motions and requests for reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law filed during calendar/fiscal year 2004: __________________

13. Of these, the number granted after imposition of the following sanction:
   a. Disbarment (involuntary, adjudicated disbarment and disbarment on consent as defined in the Terms & Phrases): ______________
   b. Suspension: ______________

14. Total number of petitions, motions or requests for reinstatement/readmission denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during calendar/fiscal year 2004: __________________

PART III. CASE LOAD

A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

15. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year 2004? (Caseload means the number of investigations and formal charges).

_________________

16. What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into calendar/fiscal year 2004 from previous years?

_________________

17. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year 2004?

_________________

18. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year 2004?

_________________
B. TIME GUIDELINES

19. In response to the 2004 survey, the following jurisdictions indicated that they have formally adopted time guidelines for case processing: AK, CA, LA, MD, MS, NE, NV, NJ, OH, OR, PA, SC, VA, and WI. If your jurisdiction has adopted such formal time guidelines, indicate so below, and provide a brief description or a copy of them:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

Yes ________  No ________

(If yes, and they are new or have changed since 2003, please include a copy or indicate below what they are.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
C. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

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

_________________

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

_________________

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

_________________

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

   Private/non-public sanction: _________________

   Public sanction: _________________

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

_________________
PART VI. FEES, DUES, AND BUDGET

A. 2004 BUDGET

26. Total budget for the lawyer discipline system in the 2004 calendar/fiscal year: $__________

27. Total budget for disciplinary counsel’s office: $__________

28. This amount includes:
   a. Salaries and benefits: Yes ______ No ______
   b. Space: Yes ______ No ______
   c. Equipment and Supplies: Yes ______ No ______
   d. Travel/Education/Training: Yes ______ No ______
   e. Other: __________________________________________
       __________________________________________
       __________________________________________

29. Total budget for disciplinary board administration: $__________

30. Please indicate the percentage of funding from each source:
   a. Bar association earmarked dues: _____________ %
   b. Supreme Court assessed fees: _____________ %
   c. Supreme Court general budget: _____________ %
   d. Legislative appropriation: _____________ %
   e. Other: (please specify) ________________________________
       ________________________________
       ________________________________
       ________________________________
B. FEES & DUES

31. Please respond to the following for calendar year 2004 or for your fiscal year ending in the month of _______________. 2004.

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

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

_____ (years in practice) $ ______

_____ (years in practice) $ ______

_____ (years in practice) $ ______

_____ (years in practice) $ ______
**PART V. STAFFING OF THE DISCIPLINARY AGENCY**

Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for 2004 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chief Disciplinary Counsel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other Disciplinary Counsel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other lawyers on staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal assistants/paralegals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Secretarial/clerical/administrative personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Law students/clerks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Auditors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Probation monitors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>TOTAL</strong> number of paid disciplinary agency staff: (should be the sum of 1 through 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is the percentage of nonlawyer members on hearing bodies in your agency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order for the Center to maintain accurate information for each jurisdiction in the Directory of Lawyer Disciplinary Agencies, please complete the following information for the Chief Disciplinary Counsel and the Disciplinary Board Chair:

Name of Chief Disciplinary Counsel: ______________________________

Title: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

Phone: ______________________________

Fax: ______________________________

E-Mail: ______________________________

Website (if available): __________________________________________

Name of Disciplinary Board Chair: ______________________________

Title: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

Phone: ______________________________

Fax: ______________________________

E-Mail: ______________________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY JUNE 1, 2005, TO:

Susan E. Dianovsky  
American Bar Association  
Center for Professional Responsibility  
321 North Clark Street, 15th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60610-4714  
PH: 312-988-6223  
FAX: 312-988-5491 or 312-988-5280  
E-Mail: sdianovsky@staff.abanet.org

*Call for an e-mail version of the survey if you prefer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Officially Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>14,197</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>149,440</td>
<td>14,168</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>10,477</td>
<td>5,843†</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>1,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>31,462</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1,089†</td>
<td>725†</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>76,068</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>67,551</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>3,777</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>6,236</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>28,119</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>78,101</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>6,937</td>
<td>4,643</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1California: In previous years this figure included inquiries closed at intake. This figure now represents the number of investigations pending on January 1st and the number of new complaints advanced to investigation stage.

1Connecticut: This figure is for those complaints processed for investigation in 2004. It equals 1,111 complaints filed minus 226 screened, plus 4 additional complaints processed when a screening appeal was adjudicated in favor of the complainant. It does not include complaints still pending as of 1-1-04.

2Connecticut: Jurisdiction's statistical reports do not indicate number of cases dismissed without formal charges in a particular year. This number is the number of complaints grievance panels returned with findings of no probable cause.
**Chart 1**

**Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume: 2004**

*Source: Survey on Lawyer Disciplinary Systems, 2004*  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Year</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Summarized &amp; Discussed for Lack of Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed for Lack of Good Faith</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,342</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>14,371</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>19,663</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>31,924</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>47,721</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>25,029</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>25,206</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This figure includes 472 regular complaints and 169 delinquency files. In Massachusetts, in addition to these complaints, the central estate Attorney and Consumer Assistance Program (A.C.A.P.), resolved without opening complaints approximately 3,500 of the 6,016 inquiries it received. None of the responses that follow include any of the 3,500 inquiries that were resolved by A.C.A.P.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Investigated</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>59,919</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 1st Jud. Dept</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 2nd Jud. Dept, 2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>13,189</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 2nd Jud. Dept, 9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>12,891</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 2nd Jud. Dept, 10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>18,672</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 3rd Jud. Dept</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 4th Jud. Dept</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>19,745</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>40,888</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15,269</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Nevada: Reflected case summarily dismissed by Bar Counsel with no investigation and without a grievance file being opened (no screening panel review).
2 Nevada: 866 investigated, but no grievance file opened; 190 grievances files opened.
3 New York: 72 dismissed outright or with a letter of caution; 16 closed with Private Reprimand.
4 Ohio: Combined Office of Disciplinary Counsel and Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline.
### CHART 1

**Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume, 2004**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004

**ABA Center for Professional Responsibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Year</th>
<th>No. of ComplaintsSummary Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Investigated</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>12,550</td>
<td>1,738 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>50,518</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>8,042</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16,871</td>
<td>1,247 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>926 2</td>
<td>1,110 3</td>
<td>48 4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>74,581</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,313</td>
<td>6,936</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>1,064 1</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>24,422</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>1,423 1</td>
<td>1,284 1</td>
<td>618 1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>21,518</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Oregon: Written complaints only.

2Tennessee: In addition, the Board's Consumer Assistance Program (Central Intake) resolved 4,567 consumer concerns by mediation or referral to other agencies.

3Tennessee: Excludes complaints from previous years.

4Tennessee: Includes complaints from previous years.

5Tennessee: Includes complaints from previous years.

6Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel only.

7Washington: Method of calculation differs from previous years.
# Chart 1

**Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume: 2004**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Disciplinary Systems 2004

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Investigated</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</th>
<th>No. of Complaints Warranting Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Formally Charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>1,220,360</td>
<td>127,171</td>
<td>33,764</td>
<td>65,775</td>
<td>88,521</td>
<td>42,298</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>3,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE*</td>
<td>23,577</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN*</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some jurisdictions supplied partial data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Unlawfully Suspended (Not Including Bar Suspension)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimarily Suspended (For Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Publicly Recommended/ Censured</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Alabama: This number does not include lawyers transferred to Disability Inactive Status.
2Arizona: Includes Informal Reprimands.
3Arkansas: Reprimands and Censures.
4California: Includes Disability Inactive Status.
5District of Columbia: Includes 34 Informal Admonitions
6Florida: Includes 65 Admonishments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Suspended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Maine: The state's only non-public form of discipline is an informal sanction entitled "dissuasion with a warning" which is not discipline.
2. Maine: One reprimand was later vacated by the Court.
5. Nevada: Number of matters currently subject to probation monitoring in the calendar year.
### Chart II

**Sanctions Imposed**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Disciplinary Systems, 2004

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned (excluding interim suspensions)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Reprimanded/Centered</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned (N.A.)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned (Transferred to Disability Inactive Status)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York: 1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd &amp; 13th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 3rd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 3rd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ohio: Includes suspensions for failure to pay child support.
2. Oregon: Includes 26 admonitions, which are public in Oregon.
3. Pennsylvania: Probation is a private sanction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</th>
<th>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Suspended</th>
<th>No. of Interim Suspended (excluding Interim Suspensions)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned Transferred to Disability Inactive Status</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned suspension suspended</th>
<th>Of Total Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned suspension suspended (other than suspension)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2300</strong></td>
<td><strong>3373</strong></td>
<td><strong>529</strong></td>
<td><strong>411</strong></td>
<td><strong>1374</strong></td>
<td><strong>434</strong></td>
<td><strong>1106</strong></td>
<td><strong>474</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some jurisdictions supplied partial data.

| Note: Washington includes Admissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions, or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</th>
<th>Total No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Granted</th>
<th>No. Granted After Disbarment</th>
<th>No. Granted After Suspension</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Denied/Dismissed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0^1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2^2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1California: All Reinstatement proceedings follow Disbarment or Resignations with Disciplinary Charges.
^2Georgia: Most Reinstatements/Readmissions handled by Office of Bar Admissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Reinstatement Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstatement Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>9th Jud. Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>10th Jud. Dist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³Nevada: 1 granted from disability inactive status
³New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon: Disbarment is permanent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Granted</th>
<th>No. Granted After Dishonesty</th>
<th>No. Granted After Suspension</th>
<th>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Granted/Discarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York 3rd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>200(^5)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0(^a)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Oregon: There are many types of reinstatement, not all related to discipline.
## DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

Not all jurisdictions maintain data

**SOURCE:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004

**ABA Center for Professional Responsibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</th>
<th>Average No. Closed Cases Carried Over From Prior Years</th>
<th>Average No. of New Cases Assumed Per Lawyer</th>
<th>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>171.9</td>
<td>178.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*California: Official caseload comprised of completed investigations. Ongoing investigations, while supervised by disciplinary counsel, are officially part of investigators’ caseloads. These supervised cases are excluded from these figures.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</th>
<th>Average No. Carried Over From Prior Year</th>
<th>Average No. of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</th>
<th>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 2d Jud. Dept. 5th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 3rd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York; 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (Office of Disciplinary Counsel only)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Oregon: Effective 8/03, a separate office handles intake and screening. Only matters surviving the screening process are reflected in this statistic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Time Standards Formally Adopted</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Close/Dismissal After Investigation</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charge</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 Week</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Yes 69 Days</td>
<td>1166 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>349 - 1035 Days</td>
<td>832 - 504 Days</td>
<td>59 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21 Days</td>
<td>209 Days</td>
<td>283 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>403 Days</td>
<td>267 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes 47 Days</td>
<td>197 Days</td>
<td>361 Days</td>
<td>452 Days</td>
<td>591 Days</td>
<td>591 Days</td>
<td>391 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>No 1.3 Weeks</td>
<td>38.7 Weeks</td>
<td>35.3 Weeks</td>
<td>76.8 Weeks</td>
<td>76.8 Weeks</td>
<td>29.4 Weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Yes N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>94 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>243 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>6 - 9 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>No 28 Days</td>
<td>64 - 96 Days</td>
<td>162 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>338 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 Week</td>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>8 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 Days</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45 Days</td>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 - 1.5 Years</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>No 4 Weeks</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>13 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Yes 367 Days</td>
<td>772 Days</td>
<td>1352 Days</td>
<td>568 Days</td>
<td>1257 Days</td>
<td>941 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 Days</td>
<td>3 - 5 Months</td>
<td>6 - 8 Months</td>
<td>3 - 5 Months</td>
<td>3 - 4 Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Yes 30 Days</td>
<td>120 Days</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12 - 13 Months</td>
<td>30 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No 48 Days</td>
<td>268 Days</td>
<td>719 Days</td>
<td>599 Days</td>
<td>893 Days</td>
<td>186 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No 45 - 60 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>165 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>No 1 Month</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Admonition - 10 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Alaska: This number is for 147 grievances.
2Alaska: This number is for 36 dismissed cases.
3Alaska: 349 days for Admonition; 1035 days for Reprimand.
4Alaska: 852 days for Suspension; 904 days for Censure.
5Massachusetts: Includes automatic Reinstatements. These responses were calculated without including any of the 5,500 inquiries that the Attorney and Consumer Assistance Program resolved without opening a complaint.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Time Standards Formally Adopted</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement Readmission from Filing in Final Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 - 3 Months</td>
<td>2 - 3 Months</td>
<td>3 - 4 Months</td>
<td>3 - 4 Months</td>
<td>3 Months - 1 Year</td>
<td>3 Months - 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>100 Days</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 - 2 Days</td>
<td>30 - 60 Days</td>
<td>4 - 6 Months</td>
<td>5 - 7 Months</td>
<td>1 - 2 Years</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 - 4 Weeks</td>
<td>30 - 90 Days</td>
<td>60 - 120 Days</td>
<td>60 - 90 Days</td>
<td>Uncontested 4-9 Months</td>
<td>Contested 9-12 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>19 Months</td>
<td>21 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 Weeks</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>4 Months - 1 Year</td>
<td>4 - 8 Months</td>
<td>1.5 Years</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 Week</td>
<td>9 - 12 Months</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>9 - 12 Months</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 3rd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>3 Months - 1 Year</td>
<td>120 Days</td>
<td>6 Months - 1 Year</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>2 - 6 Months</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>8 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mississippi: Timing depends upon when Supreme Court rules on petition.*
## CHART V

### CASE PROCESSING TIMES
Not all jurisdictions maintain data.

**SOURCE:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Time Standards Formally Adopted</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Disposal After Investigation</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</th>
<th>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion or Request for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 Weeks</td>
<td>60 - 150 Days</td>
<td>150+ Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>6 Months (hearing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 - 20 Days</td>
<td>120 Days</td>
<td>150 Days</td>
<td>130 Days</td>
<td>360 Days</td>
<td>270 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>140 Days</td>
<td>300 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 Days</td>
<td>50 Days</td>
<td>7 Months</td>
<td>15 Months</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>7 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 Days</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>6 - 8 Months</td>
<td>8 - 10 Months</td>
<td>8 - 10 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 - 5 Days</td>
<td>60 - 90 Days7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>9 Months - 1 Year8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 Days</td>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 - 5 Days</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 - 2 Years</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83 Days</td>
<td>231 Days</td>
<td>396 Days</td>
<td>703 Days</td>
<td>933 Days</td>
<td>241 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 Days</td>
<td>60 - 90 Days</td>
<td>90 - 120 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45 Days</td>
<td>140 Days</td>
<td>300 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30 Days</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15 Months</td>
<td>20 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55 Days</td>
<td>394 Days</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>394 Days</td>
<td>456 Days</td>
<td>307 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 Days</td>
<td>10 Weeks</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7South Carolina: If dismissed by Disciplinary Counsel after preliminary investigation.
8South Carolina: Number varies if an agreement is reached and accepted sooner and no hearing is held.
9South Carolina: Not handled by Office of Disciplinary Counsel except to file return and make appearance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</th>
<th>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/Adjudicative Budget ($)</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>789,650</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>608,299</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>614,966</td>
<td>597,966</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees, assessed fines and costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>149,440</td>
<td>31,809,447</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20,839</td>
<td>3,873,129</td>
<td>3,091,637</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>31,402</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court general budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>76,068</td>
<td>4,699,123</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>67,551</td>
<td>9,656,587</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>55% Bar Association earmarked dues, 5% cost reimbursement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>28,119</td>
<td>1,809,997</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>1,167,225</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>1,167,225</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>372,220</td>
<td>350,099</td>
<td>22,122</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>78,101</td>
<td>12,673,285</td>
<td>10,875,118</td>
<td>1,798,167</td>
<td>97.29% Supreme Court assessed fees; 1.56% interest earned and 1.11% recovered costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>1,666,834</td>
<td>1,638,797</td>
<td>Included in 1,638,797</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,342</td>
<td>712,266</td>
<td>652,158</td>
<td>63,108</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>14,371</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,030,000</td>
<td>Included in 1,030,000</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>861,154</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>19,663</td>
<td>3,311,348</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>1,211,348</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>817,136</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>99% Supreme Court assessed fees; 3% MCLE and 3% other income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>31,934</td>
<td>3,579,799</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court general budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>47,721</td>
<td>7,906,199</td>
<td>4,656,355</td>
<td>1,466,224</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart VI

**State by State Budget for Discipline: 2004**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total No. of Lawyers with Active License</th>
<th>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative Adjudication Budget ($)</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>35,609</td>
<td>4,019,302</td>
<td>3,033,433</td>
<td>983,869</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>25,029</td>
<td>2,551,910</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>437,759</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>25,206</td>
<td>2,050,980</td>
<td>1,797,980</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>397,106</td>
<td>266,186</td>
<td>130,920</td>
<td>61% Supreme Court assessed fees, 39% Supreme Court general budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>1,052,000</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>869,224</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96% Supreme Court assessed fees, 4% Character and Fitness Committee fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>59,919</td>
<td>8,981,159</td>
<td>5,463,316</td>
<td>1,733,028</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>727,680</td>
<td>649,680</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>3,689,076</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>13,189</td>
<td>1,224,442</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>12,891</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,616,975</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>18,672</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,971,251</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 3rd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>1,164,390</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included in 1,164,390</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,756,014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New York 10th Jud. Dept. for 2004-2005,*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</th>
<th>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Disciplinary Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total Disciplinary Board or Comparable Administrative Budget ($)</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>19,745</td>
<td>1,019,526</td>
<td>381,322</td>
<td>60,669</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>269,321</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51% Bar Association earmarked dues and 49% Legislative appropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>40,888</td>
<td>3,900,599</td>
<td>1,942,685</td>
<td>1,937,014²</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15,269</td>
<td>855,777</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>General budget line item - General Counsel budget accounts for 19% of overall budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>12,559</td>
<td>2,140,000</td>
<td>1,695,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>56,518</td>
<td>7,427,500</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>92% Supreme Court assessed fees; 8% late payment fees, investments, and interest income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>715,304</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>715,304</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court general budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>100% Bar Association non-earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16,871</td>
<td>2,006,600</td>
<td>2,006,600</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>95% Supreme Court assessed fees; 5% interest earnings and reimbursement of expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>74,581</td>
<td>7,312,275</td>
<td>7,179,442</td>
<td>132,858</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8,413</td>
<td>794,031</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>359,114</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100% Supreme Court assessed fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>3,500,737</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>24,422</td>
<td>3,285,341</td>
<td>3,157,501</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>97% Bar Association dues; 3% cost recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>673,984</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>673,984</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>21,518</td>
<td>2,201,000</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>117,550</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>100% Bar Association earmarked dues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²Ohio: Includes $1,286,123 to reimburse costs of Certified Grievance Committees.
### Chart VII

#### Allocation of Dues and Fees in State Disciplinary Systems

**Source:** Survey of Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004

**ABA Center for Professional Responsibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Salaries/Benefits</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment/Supplies</th>
<th>Travel/Education/Training</th>
<th>Annual Dues/Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>315 / 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100 / 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50 / 155 / 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>190 / 210 / 265 / 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>104 / 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100 / 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50 / 50 / 140 / 255 / 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0 / 90 / 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Arizona: 0-2 years in practice/2+ years in practice
2Arkansas: 0-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice
3California: Reduction of dues based on income available upon request.
4Colorado: Inactive/0-2 years in practice/2+ years in practice.
5Connecticut: Includes $425 occupational tax plus $75 client security fund fee.
6Delaware: Government employees 0-5 years in practice/5-10 years in practice/10+ years in practice.
7Georgia: Inactive/Active
8Hawaii: 0-4 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
9Idaho: Also includes staff, insurance, share of Board Commission's meeting expenses, investigation, hearing and pre-trial expenses, publications and dues; committee expenses re UPOL and fee arbitration matters.
10Idaho: 7+ years old and less than 1 year in practice and admitted 7-11+ years in practice and admitted before 7-11+3 years in practice.
11Illinois: Less than 1 year in practice/1-3 years in practice or inactive/3+ years in practice.
### Chart VII

**ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Salaries/Benefits</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment/Supplies</th>
<th>Travel/Education/Training</th>
<th>Annual Dues/Fees ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>110 / 220 / 270&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>100 / 165&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87 / 192 / 87 / 122&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>165 / 220 / 20&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>67 / 218 / 107&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50 / 70 / 130 / 270&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>133 / 145 / 198&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>220 / 320&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>200 / 350 / 500 / 100&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>15</sup>Kentucky: Judges 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>10</sup>Louisiana: 0-1 years in practice/3+ years in practice.
<sup>14</sup>Maine: Active resident 0-2 years in practice/Active resident more than 2 years in practice/Active non-resident 0-2 years in practice/Active non-resident more than 2 years in practice.
<sup>16</sup>Massachusetts: 0-5 years in practice/5-20 years in practice/50+ years in practice.
<sup>14</sup>Minnesota: 0-2 years in practice/3+ years in practice/Non-resident and Military.
<sup>17</sup>Mississippi: Less than one year in practice/1 year in practice/2-3 years in practice/4+ years in practice.
<sup>19</sup>Missouri: Nonresident/0-2 years in practice/Nonresident 3+ years in practice.
<sup>32</sup>Nebraska: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>9</sup>Nevada: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice/annual fee for multi-jurisdictional practice/federal judiciary member.
## CHART VII

**ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

*SOURCE: Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems. 2004*  
*ABA Center for Professional Responsibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Office Budget Includes</th>
<th>Salary/Benefits</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment/Supplies</th>
<th>Travel/Education/Training</th>
<th>Annual Dues/Fees ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 / 165 / 190&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>745 / 295 / 345&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 3rd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York 4th Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350 biennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>300 / 325 / 355&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>275 biennially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>11</sup>New Jersey: 0-2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/5-10 years in practice.
<sup>12</sup>New Mexico: Budget also includes accounting services, employee benefits, insurance, subscriptions, payroll taxes, and retirement fund management.
<sup>13</sup>New Mexico: Less than one year in practice/2-3 years in practice/4+ years in practice.
<sup>16</sup>North Dakota: Less than 1 year in practice/1-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
### Chart VII

**Allocation of Duties and Fees in State Disciplinary Systems**

**Source:** Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2004

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

**Disciplinary Office Budget Includes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Salaries/Benefits</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equipment/Supplies</th>
<th>Travel/Education/Training</th>
<th>Annual Fees (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87 / 175&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0 / 115 / 360 / 432&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>350&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>150 / 225&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190 / 315&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>190 / 350&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>191 / 312 / 383&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50 / 150 / 195&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>&lt;345 / 345&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>137 / 250&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Oklahoma: Less than three years in practice/3+ years in practice.
<sup>2</sup> Oregon: 50+ years in practice/15+ years in practice and limited to pro bono work/less than 2 years in practice/2+ years in practice.
<sup>3</sup> Rhode Island: This includes a mandatory fee of $125 and an Annual Registration fee of $150.
<sup>4</sup> South Carolina: 0-3 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>5</sup> South Dakota: 1-4 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>6</sup> Utah: 3-3 years in practice/3+ years in practice.
<sup>7</sup> Washington: 1-2 years in practice/2-4 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>8</sup> West Virginia: Inactive and less than one year in practice/1-3 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<sup>9</sup> Wisconsin: 0-2 years in practice or at a reduced rate/3+ years in practice.
<sup>10</sup> Wyoming: 0-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Lawyers</th>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Legal Assistants/Paralegals</th>
<th>Secretarial/ Clerical Admin</th>
<th>Law Students/ Clerks</th>
<th>Auditors</th>
<th>Probation Monitors</th>
<th>Other Paid Staff</th>
<th>Total Paid Staff</th>
<th>% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 : 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 : 1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 : 02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 : 03</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 : 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 : 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 : 1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 : 24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53 : 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101 : 28</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 : 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 : 2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 : 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 : 1</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37 : 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 : 3</td>
<td>0 : 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83 : 9 : 4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 : 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 : 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 : 4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33% - 15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 : 1</td>
<td>13 : 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 : 4</td>
<td>41 : 6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 : 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 : 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Delaware: Paid for by the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection.
4. Indiana: Not an adjudicative body.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Lawyers</th>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Legal Assistants/Paralegals</th>
<th>Secretarial/Clerical Admin</th>
<th>Law Students/Clerks</th>
<th>Auditors</th>
<th>Probation Monitors</th>
<th>Other Paid Staff</th>
<th>Total Paid Staff</th>
<th>% Nonlawyer Members on Hearing Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 ; 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47 ; 2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 ; 1</td>
<td>8 ; 1</td>
<td>0 ; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 ; 3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 ; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 ; 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 ; 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 ; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 ; 12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 ; 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 ; 5</td>
<td>1 ; 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 ; 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64 ; 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 ; 1</td>
<td>0 ; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 ; 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Jud. Dept.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 ; 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46 ; 1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 11th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 ; 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 ; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 ; 2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Jud. Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Jud. Dist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ; 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Michigan: For Attorney Grievance Commission and Disciplinary Board.
4 Nevada: Probation monitoring performed by one paralegal.
5 New York 10th Judicial District: For formal hearings. Nonlawyers comprise 70% of Grievance Committee members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Disciplinary Counsel</th>
<th>Other Lawyers</th>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Legal Assistants/Paralegals</th>
<th>Secretarial/Clerical/Admin</th>
<th>Law Students/Clacks</th>
<th>Auditors</th>
<th>Probation Monitors</th>
<th>Other Paid Staff</th>
<th>Total Paid Staff</th>
<th>% Nonlawyers Member of Hearing Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15; 5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4; 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7; 1</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21; 3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23; 1</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio, Discipline Counsel's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2; 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21; 2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13; 1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5; 0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15; 0.6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0; 3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57; 3.5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8; 1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0; 2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98; 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0; 0.5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5; 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36; 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11; 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23; 4</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0; 2</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ohio: Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline.
North Carolina: Two non-lawyers are on investigative panels.
South Carolina: Consumer Assistance Program lawyer.