

**2007 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS**  
**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE**

**David S. Baker**  
CHAIR  
Atlanta, GA

**Anthony L. Butler**  
SPECIAL ADVISOR  
Seattle, WA

**Karen Gould**  
Richmond, VA

**Gwendolyn D. Hodge**  
Little Rock, AR

**Mark Johnson**  
Portland, OR

**Larry Ramirez**  
Las Cruces, NM

**Arnold R. Rosenfeld**  
Boston, MA

**Barry Sullivan**  
Chicago, IL

**Professor Laurel S. Terry**  
Carlisle, PA

**Robert D. Welden**  
Seattle, WA

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

**Jeanne P. Gray, DIRECTOR**

**Mary M. Devlin, REGULATION COUNSEL**

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

**Kimley Grant, REGULATION PARALEGAL**

# **2007 ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (SOLD)**

## **Introduction to 2007 SOLD Results**

The ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems questionnaire for 2007 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. All responded to the questionnaire. Medians and averages are shown where potentially meaningful. In most instances, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The 2007 Survey consists of nine charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction, with explanatory footnotes. These charts were compiled from statistics reported to the ABA by the jurisdictions. Where exact figures were not available estimated figures were provided and noted with an asterisk. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data was not available or applicable.

Questions regarding the Survey should be addressed to Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, 321 North Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654-7598, (312) 988-5311, [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org).

## **2007 SOLD Survey Results**

The information contained in the 2007 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems is not intended to constitute a comprehensive overview of each jurisdiction's lawyer discipline system. Where possible, footnotes have been included to address variations in the manner in which jurisdictions function and maintain statistics. If you have any questions regarding a particular jurisdiction's responses to the Survey, please contact the chief disciplinary counsel for that agency. Contact information for lawyer disciplinary agencies is at <http://www.abanet.org/cpr/regulation/scpd/disciplinary.html>.

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

## TERMS AND PHRASES

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

### **Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System:**

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

### **Adjudicative Counsel:**

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

### **Adjudicative Staff:**

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

### **Complaint:**

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

### **Disbarment on Consent:**

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

**Charges:**

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

**Investigation:**

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

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

**Private/Non-Public Sanction:**

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

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

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

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

Please fill in the appropriate figures for calendar year 2007 or for your fiscal year 2007. Where a question asks for an average, such as in Part III, Sections A. & C., please provide that number for the calendar or fiscal year that you use. Some questions will ask for data relating to other years. If you have any concerns regarding how to respond to a particular question, please contact Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel, at [rosene@staff.abanet.org](mailto:rosene@staff.abanet.org).

If your jurisdiction does not maintain the type of data or engage in the type of activity requested, please answer with the designation N/A. Please indicate estimates by adding an asterisk to that response.

The Survey questionnaire is intended to be as brief as possible, while still allowing us to gather essential, accurate and complete information. There is a need to provide standardized data for national comparisons. We understand that this can be complicated by the diversity of lawyer disciplinary systems and terminology utilized by the various agencies. As a result, where necessary, please provide footnotes to any responses where there is a **major** variation in procedures. We will attempt to include explanatory footnotes to the extent possible.

**A. LAWYER POPULATION**

1. Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with **active** licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the **2007** calendar/fiscal year:

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS**

2. Total number of complaints (as defined in Terms and Phrases) received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct during the **2007** calendar/fiscal year: \_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Does your jurisdiction have a central intake or other consumer assistance program?  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. If yes, does the number of complaints received by the agency include matters handled by such a program? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. If the total number of complaints received by the agency **does not include** matters handled by central intake or other consumer assistance program, how many matters were handled separately by the program? \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. If the total number of complaints received by the agency **includes** matters handled by central intake or other consumer assistance program, how many matters were handled by the program? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency prior to the **2007** calendar/fiscal year that were still pending on the first day of the **2007** calendar/fiscal year:

---

4. Total number of complaints that were screened out or dismissed without investigation during the **2007** 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 **2007** calendar/fiscal year):

---

5. Total number of complaints that were investigated during the **2007** calendar/fiscal year. (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the **2007** 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 **2007** calendar/fiscal year after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant charges(as defined in Terms and Phrases).

---

7. Total number of lawyers against whom charges (as defined in Terms and Phrases) were brought/initiated after a determination of probable cause in calendar/fiscal year **2007**:

---

**C. SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

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

If yes, what is the total number of lawyers who received private, i.e., non-public, disciplinary sanctions during calendar/fiscal year **2007**:

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the calendar/fiscal year **2007**:

\_\_\_\_\_

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

a. Who received involuntary/adjudicated disbarments:

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

**D. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION STATISTICS**

11. Total number of lawyers who sought reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law during calendar/fiscal year **2007**: \_\_\_\_\_
12. Total number of lawyers who were reinstated/readmitted in calendar/fiscal year **2007** after:
- a. Disbarment (any type as defined in the Terms & Phrases): \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Suspension: \_\_\_\_\_
13. Total number of lawyers whose requests for reinstatement/readmission were denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during calendar/fiscal year **2007**:  
\_\_\_\_\_



**PART II. CASE LOAD STATISTICS**

**A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL**

14. What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2007**? (Caseload or cases means the number of investigations and charges).

\_\_\_\_\_

15. What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into calendar/fiscal year **2007** from previous years?

\_\_\_\_\_

16. What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year **2007**?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. What was the average number of cases closed per staff lawyer during calendar/fiscal year **2007**?

\_\_\_\_\_

**B. TIME GUIDELINES**

18. In response to the **2006** survey, the following jurisdictions indicated that they have formally adopted time guidelines for case processing: AK, AZ, CA, CT, FL, HI, LA, MD, NE, NV, ND, OH, OR, PA, TX, and WI. If your jurisdiction has since adopted such formal time guidelines, please indicate below and provide a brief description or a copy of them:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### C. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Please indicate estimates by asterisks:

In 2007, What was:

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

**A. 2007 BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING**

24. Total budget for the lawyer discipline system (disciplinary counsel's office and the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system) (see Terms and Phrases) in the **2007** calendar/fiscal year: \$\_\_\_\_\_
25. Of the amount in response to Question 24, the total budget for disciplinary counsel's office:  
\$\_\_\_\_\_
26. Of the amount in response to Question 24, the total budget for the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system (see Terms and Phrases):  
\$\_\_\_\_\_
27. Please indicate the percentage of funding from each source:
- a. Bar association earmarked dues: \_\_\_\_\_ %
  - b. Supreme Court assessed fees: \_\_\_\_\_ %
  - c. Supreme Court general budget: \_\_\_\_\_ %
  - d. Legislative appropriation: \_\_\_\_\_ %
  - e. Other: (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**B. ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES & FEES**

Please respond to the following for your calendar/fiscal year **2007**.

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

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

_____ (years in practice)	\$ _____
_____ (years in practice)	\$ _____
_____ (years in practice)	\$ _____
_____ (years in practice)	\$ _____

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

**Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for 2007 in each category, e.g., when two individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal one full-time equivalent. Decimals may be used, e.g., when three individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal 1.5 full-time equivalents. Please report paid staff only.**

**A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

	<b><u>Full Time</u></b>	<b><u>Part Time</u></b>
1. Chief Disciplinary Counsel:	_____	_____
2. Other Disciplinary Counsel:	_____	_____
3. Other lawyers on staff:	_____	_____
4. Investigators:	_____	_____
5. Legal assistants/paralegals:	_____	_____
6. Secretarial/clerical/administrative personnel:	_____	_____
7. Law students/clerks:	_____	_____
8. Auditors:	_____	_____
9. Probation monitors:	_____	_____
10. Other staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)	_____	_____
11. <b>TOTAL</b> number of paid disciplinary counsel's office staff: (should be the sum of 1 through 10)	_____	_____

**B. ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES OF THE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM**

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

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Alabama	14,285	1,398	291	1,181	233	145	28
Alaska	2,913	264	58	205	31	21	6
Arizona	16,038	3,914 <sup>1</sup>	864	1,047	1,797	545	101
Arkansas	8,500 *	819	N/A	0	924	784	140 <sup>2</sup>
California	161,437	16,684 <sup>3</sup>	3,526	13,310	4,889	1,637	385
Colorado	21,900	4,016 <sup>4</sup>	33	3,471	372	189	52
Connecticut	35,387	1,263	N/A	158	1,110 *	861	163 <sup>2</sup>
Delaware	3,435	354	59	75	338	228	32
District of Columbia	63,115	1,277	388	803	862	474	38
Florida	68,589	7,827 <sup>5</sup>	3,321	1,767	7,296	5,315	73
Georgia	31,528	2,794 <sup>6</sup>	341	2,496	356	178	193 <sup>2</sup>
Hawaii	4,700	549	340	101	448	46	4 <sup>^</sup>
Idaho	3,988	414	232	429	351	40	9
Illinois	82,380	5,988 <sup>7</sup>	1,896	1,508	6,070	4,117	279

\* = Estimated.

<sup>1</sup>Arizona: Includes 2,742 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>2</sup>Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia: Represents number of cases, not lawyers.

<sup>3</sup>California: Includes matters handled by central intake. The State Bar of California defines a complaint as a communication concerning the conduct of a member received by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel which is designated for evaluation to determine if any action is warranted.

<sup>4</sup>Colorado: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>5</sup>Florida: Excludes 1,898 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>6</sup>Georgia: Excludes matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>^</sup>Hawaii: The previous recorded number of 331 was in error.

<sup>7</sup>Illinois: Includes 4,117 matters handled by central intake.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Indiana	16,885	1,598	839	960	1,477	411	34
Iowa	8,578	904	260	120 *	799	595	40
Kansas	10,532	893	N/A	359	524	411	53
Kentucky	15,581 *	1,285 <sup>8</sup>	491	809	1,091	426	50
Louisiana	20,228	2,712	2,566	1,436	3,810	805	113
Maine	4,869	342	74	42	381	211	21
Maryland	33,487	1,940	354	1,589	722	368	57
Massachusetts	52,143	970 <sup>9</sup>	955	53	1925	881	150
Michigan	37,668	3,293	NA	2,219	686	535	168
Minnesota	25,775	1,226	578	552	1,252	465	23
Mississippi	8,331	549	21	382	28	11	22
Missouri	29,343	2,359 <sup>10</sup>	524	1,422	1,240	514	47
Montana	3,402	379	219	140	484	197	41
Nebraska	6,381	544	78	169	375	319	48
Nevada	7,463	1,614	N/A	161 <sup>11</sup>	1,453 <sup>12</sup>	71 <sup>13</sup>	17
New Hampshire	4,531	134	107	130	178	50	21
New Jersey	81,684	1,553	1,067	6,217 *	1,494	N/A	219

\* = Estimated.

<sup>8</sup>Kentucky: Includes 552 matters handled by central intake.

<sup>9</sup>Massachusetts: Excludes 5,292 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>10</sup>Missouri: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>11</sup>Nevada: Reflects best estimate of cases summarily dismissed by Bar Counsel with no investigation and without a grievance file being opened (no screening panel review).

<sup>12</sup>Nevada: 1,199 cases were investigated, but no grievance file opened, plus 254 grievance files opened for a combined total of 1,453.

<sup>13</sup>Nevada: Of 254 grievance files opened, 71 were dismissed outright or dismissed with letters of caution, and an additional 16 were closed with private reprimands.



CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
New Mexico	6,365	484	196	456	61	0	18
New York 1st Judicial Department	88,000	3,517	1,111	1,293	3,335	2,032	59
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Districts	13,857	2,076	885	1,183	1,244	437	60
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th District	13,634	1,341	669	409	789	412	103
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	19,943	2,137 <sup>14</sup>	1,543	1,069	803	670	40
New York 3rd Judicial Department	9,500 *	1,709	617	1,024	591	255	224
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th & 8th Districts	13,153	2,224	847	1,123	1,948	1,047	22
North Carolina	22,222	1,466 <sup>15</sup>	700	965	581	385	30
North Dakota	1,931	194	115	57	252	134	N/A

\* = Estimated.

<sup>14</sup>New York 2nd Judicial Dept. 10th Judicial District: Includes 609 matters handled by central intake.

<sup>15</sup>North Carolina: Excludes 2,789 complaints handled by consumer assistance program.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Ohio	41,831	5,284	N/A	3,037	2,247	N/A	103
Oklahoma	16,027	390	283	1,071	444	378	20
Oregon	13,500	1,721 <sup>16</sup>	N/A	650 *	1,070 *	890 *	133
Pennsylvania	60,619	4,733	883	114	5,502	4,045	237
Rhode Island	8,000	388	N/A	98	290	276	14
South Carolina	8,200	1,402	713	203	1,280	1,025	255
South Dakota	2,282	118	48	20	118	97	9
Tennessee	18,568	1,064 <sup>17</sup>	315	180	1,363	412	69
Texas	80,094	6,954 <sup>18</sup>	N/A	4,445	2,247	1,574	582
Utah	7,245	999 <sup>19</sup>	435	904	1,465	74	24
Vermont	2,000 *	262 <sup>20</sup>	50	71	333	156	14
Virginia	26,937	4,045 <sup>21</sup>	837	2,414	1,895	720	N/A

\* = Estimated.

<sup>16</sup>Oregon: Includes 1,629 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>17</sup>Tennessee: Excludes 4,380 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>18</sup>Texas: Excludes 4,160 cases handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>19</sup>Utah: Includes 42 matters handled by central intake.

<sup>20</sup>Vermont: Excludes 331 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

<sup>21</sup>Virginia: Includes 2,987 matters handled by consumer assistance program.

CHART I

LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers with Active License</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Summarily Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Investigated</u>	<u>No. of Complaints Dismissed After Investigation</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</u>
Washington	26,730	2,589 <sup>22</sup>	1,067	1,125	2,196	906	83
West Virginia	6,169	577	411	204	989	580	15
Wisconsin	18,767	1,896 <sup>23</sup>	817	1,564	1,149	128	37
Wyoming	1,864	172	4 *	119	55 *	31	4 *
<b>TOTAL*</b>	1,412,514	117,598	32,028	67,109	75,243	37,514	4,782
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	25,223	2,100	681	1,198	1,344	695	89
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	14,933	1,370	435	727	893	412	4,782

\* = Estimated.

<sup>22</sup>Washington: Includes matters handled by central intake.

<sup>23</sup>Wisconsin: Includes matters handled by central intake.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Involuntarily Disbarred</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>
Alabama	36	45	6	2	9	4	15	9
Alaska	1	5	2	0	1	0	2	0
Arizona	N/A	128	8	4	27	5	24	69
Arkansas	41	67	2	7	15	3	60	0
California	41	299	57	46	143	91	53	122
Colorado	1	78	5	4	42	18	9	18
Connecticut	N/A	127	4	12	12	11	33	3
Delaware	16	10	1	1	3	3	2	0
District of Columbia	N/A	106	15	6	31	44	47	7
Florida	N/A	445	66	13	134	16	136	62
Georgia	60	59	9	7	17	18	8	N/A
Hawaii	38	9	7	0	2	2	0	0
Idaho	32	7	0	0	1	1	5	3
Illinois	N/A	125	12	12	60	11	25	16
Indiana	9	51	0	1	39	4	11	9
Iowa	98	61	3	0	15	18	25	0
Kansas	N/A	53	1	4	8	4	35	1
Kentucky	51	40	8	1	20	5	6	4

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Involuntarily Disbarred</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>
Louisiana	17	82	20	9	15	22	21	4
Maine	15	13	1	0	2	1	9	1
Maryland	N/A	57	9	8	20	1	19	N/A
Massachusetts	50	104	15	12	46	14	31	6
Michigan	180	139	12	5	64	17	40	18
Minnesota	133	31	3	2	21	3	0	8
Mississippi	26	29	4	1	18	2	7	0
Missouri	N/A	63 <sup>1</sup>	13	2	15	8	16	13
Montana	25	16	4	0	6	0	5	2
Nebraska	16	18	1	4	5	8	0	4
Nevada	21	12	2	1	1	2	4	1
New Hampshire	N/A	22	5	3	6	2	16	N/A
New Jersey	N/A	121	16	15	33	34	57 <sup>2</sup>	0

<sup>1</sup>Missouri: Does not include 149 admonitions. Under Rule 5.31 (d) Admonitions are public only 3 years.

<sup>2</sup>New Jersey: Includes 19 admonitions, 25 public reprimands, and 13 censures.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Involuntarily Disbarred</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>
New Mexico	7	11	2	0	1	5	3	6
New York 1st Judicial Department	69	76	30	16	11	13	6	N/A
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Jud. Districts	152	36	13	9	4	5	5	N/A
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	38 <sup>3</sup>	27	4	9	11 <sup>4</sup>	N/A	3	N/A
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	35	29	12	4	7	4	2	N/A
New York 3rd Judicial Department	90	34	15	0	6	6	7	1
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th and 8th Jud. Dist.	19	36	5	3	14	5	9	N/A
North Carolina	109	57	9	3	4	1	34	6
North Dakota	11	7	1	0	2	3	3	0
Ohio	N/A	104	9	14	62	15	5	N/A
Oklahoma	15	19	1	12	1	2	1	0

<sup>3</sup>New York 2nd Judicial Dept 9th Judicial District: Cases not lawyers.

<sup>4</sup>New York 2nd Judicial Dept 9th Judicial District: Includes definite, interim and indefinite suspensions.

CHART II

SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Privately Sanctioned</u>	<u>No. of Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Involuntarily Disbarred</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Disbarred On Consent</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Interimly Suspended (for risk of harm or criminal conviction)</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. Reprimanded/ Censured</u>	<u>Lawyers Publicly Sanctioned No. on Probation</u>
Oregon	N/A	108	1	10	35	4	62	0
Pennsylvania	99	91	12	13	48	16	3	6
Rhode Island	26	5	0	2	1	0	1	1
South Carolina	161	81	16	N/A	42	10	23	N/A
South Dakota	30	3	0	2	0	0	1	0
Tennessee	102	29	8	0	14	10 <sup>5</sup>	7	N/A
Texas	87	233	30 <sup>6</sup>	31	110	6	62	N/A
Utah	18	27	3	4	4	1	11	5
Vermont	5	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
Virginia	61	55	4	7	19	N/A	25	N/A
Washington	N/A	68	18	7	26	12	19	2
West Virginia	N/A	18	6	0	5	0	7	0
Wisconsin	22	58	5	3 <sup>7</sup>	27	3	22	N/A
Wyoming	6	4	0	0	1	3*	2*	6*
<b>TOTAL*</b>	2,069	3,640	515	331	1,288	496	1,044	413
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	49	65	9	6	23	9	19	10
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	34	48	5	4	14	5	9	3

\* = Estimated.

<sup>5</sup>Tennessee: Not a disciplinary sanction.

<sup>6</sup>Texas: Does not distinguish between types of disbarment. This number represents total disbarments.

<sup>7</sup>Wisconsin: Does not include total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
Alabama	8	0	6	2
Alaska	1	0	1	0
Arizona	25	0	14	3
Arkansas	6	0	6	0
California	11	2	N/A <sup>1</sup>	3
Colorado	12	1	6	3
Connecticut	7	0	2	1
Delaware	1	0	1	1
District of Columbia	1	2	0	0
Florida	10	3	10	N/A
Georgia	N/A	N/A <sup>2</sup>	N/A	0
Hawaii	6	0	1	0
Idaho	1	0	1	0
Illinois	11	0	0	5
Indiana	11	0	1	7
Iowa	11	0	11	0
Kansas	3	0	2	0
Kentucky	7	0	5	0
Louisiana	6	0	2	4
Maine	1	0	0	1

<sup>1</sup>California: Reinstatement proceedings are not conducted on suspended attorneys.

<sup>2</sup>Georgia: Disbarred lawyers must apply to Bar Admissions not General Counsel for reinstatement.



CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
Maryland	8	0	3	5
Massachusetts	16 <sup>3</sup>	0	17	2
Michigan	12	0	5	3
Minnesota	14	0	7	2
Mississippi	3	0	2	1
Missouri	35 <sup>4</sup>	0	16	8
Montana	2	0	0	1
Nebraska	2	1	0	0
Nevada	3	0	0	0
New Hampshire	2	0	1	0
New Jersey	N/A	0 <sup>5</sup>	12	N/A
New Mexico	1	0	1	0
New York 1st Judicial Department	20	2	4	4
New York 2nd Judicial Department 2nd & 11th Judicial Districts	9	2	1	6
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	4	0	2	2
New York 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	8	4	3	1

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

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

<sup>5</sup>New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon: Disbarment is permanent.

CHART III

REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Filed</u>	<u>No. Granted After Disbarment</u>	<u>No. Granted After Suspension</u>	<u>No. of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement/Readmission Denied/Dismissed</u>
New York 3rd Judicial Department	8	0	8	0
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th & 8th Judicial District	8	0	6	2
North Carolina	4	0	3	1
North Dakota	1	0	1	0
Ohio	2	N/A <sup>5</sup>	13 <sup>6</sup>	N/A
Oklahoma	12	0	8	1
Oregon	176 <sup>7</sup>	0 <sup>5</sup>	20	4
Pennsylvania	92	4	13	16
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	11	0	0
South Dakota	1	0	1	0
Tennessee	4	N/A <sup>8</sup>	N/A <sup>8</sup>	3
Texas	6	2 <sup>9</sup>	0	1
Utah	5	0	3	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	2	2	N/A	1
Washington	13	0	12	0
West Virginia	4	0	2	1
Wisconsin	17	1	4	3
Wyoming	1	1	0	0

<sup>5</sup>Ohio, Oregon, New Jersey: Disbarment is permanent.

<sup>6</sup>Ohio: Automatic reinstatments from "term suspensions" and "indefinite suspensions".

<sup>7</sup>Oregon: Not all reinstatements are related to discipline.

<sup>8</sup>Tennessee: Total of 3 lawyers reinstated in 2007.

<sup>9</sup>Texas: Total of 2 reinstatements granted, but statistic does not distinguish between those granted after suspension or after disbarment.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. Carried Over From Prior Years</u>	<u>Average No. of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</u>
Arizona	270	123	147	199
Arkansas	200*	N/A	205*	240*
California	71 <sup>1</sup>	58	61	11
Colorado	112	32	72	98
Connecticut	61	52.5	72.5	46.75
Delaware	118	12	108	90
District of Columbia	86	39	47	47.4
Florida	405	106	299	236
Georgia	29	20	16	16
Hawaii	177	N/A	92	96
Idaho	226	167	168	179
Illinois	140	140	830	820
Iowa	243	54	189	N/A
Kansas	250	N/A	250	N/A
Kentucky	82	129	134	175
Louisiana	381	249	132	132
Maine	136	25	105	84
Maryland	40	44	44	46
Massachusetts	125.6	60.9	64.6	78.8
Michigan	60	N/A	110	100
Minnesota	37	33	41	37
Mississippi	38	10	28	25
Montana	484	198	286	242
Nebraska	125	26	125	106

\* = Estimated.

<sup>1</sup>California: Only includes cases that are part of the attorney's official caseload. If supervised cases are included, the average is 112 per attorney.

CHART IV

DISCIPLINARY AGENCY CASELOAD STATISTICS

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Average Caseload Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. Carried Over From Prior Years</u>	<u>Average No. of New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</u>	<u>Average No. of Cases Closed Per Lawyer</u>
New Mexico	107	35	96	94
New York 1st Judicial Department	36	33	104	105
New York 2nd Judicial Department 9th Judicial District	79	70	93	156
New York; 2nd Judicial Department 10th Judicial District	80	154	214	248
New York 3rd Judicial Department	388	103	285	269
New York 4th Judicial Department 5th, 7th and 8th Judicial District	409	113	297	310
North Carolina	187	70	133	122
Ohio <sup>2</sup>	125	97	179	156
Oklahoma	14	9	5	7
Oregon <sup>3</sup>	42*	N/A	60*	60*
Pennsylvania	212	34	182	177
Rhode Island	50	N/A	50	47
South Carolina	100	10	200	180
Tennessee	190	194	160	143
Texas	40	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	244	76	169	176
Vermont	108	25	83	78
Virginia	189	84	104	82
West Virginia	255*	100*	145	154
Wisconsin	39	51	118	137

\* = Estimated.

<sup>2</sup>Ohio: For Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) only; does not include the staff at the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline (BoC) or at the 35 Certified Grievance Committees.

<sup>3</sup>Oregon: Excludes caseload for consumer assistance program.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
Alabama	N/A	1 Week	6 Months	12 Months	9 Months	12 Months	6 Months
Alaska	Yes	56 Days	464 Days	N/A	253 Days	281 Days <sup>1</sup>	50 Days
Arizona	Yes	57 Days	203 Days	240 Days	N/A	551 Days	350 Days
California	Yes	49 Days	186 Days	408 Days	611 Days	833 Days*	440 Days
Colorado	N/A	1.9 Weeks	35.4 Weeks	34.8 Weeks	56.6 Weeks	60.2 Weeks	17.5 Weeks
Connecticut	Yes	15 Days	92 Days	92 Days	N/A	217 Days	N/A
Delaware	N/A	7-14 Days	60 Days	120 Days	120 Days	210 Days	180 Days
Georgia	N/A	3 Days	60 Days	6 Months	9 Months	14 Months	2 Months <sup>2</sup>
Idaho	N/A	4 Weeks*	9 Months*	9 Months*	9 Months*	2 Years*	3 Months*
Iowa	N/A	3 Days	5 Months	18 Months	6 Months	15 Months	3 Months
Kansas	N/A	1 Week	N/A	9 Months -1 Year	N/A	1 - 1 1/2Years	1 - 1 1/2 Years
Kentucky	N/A	12 Days	65 Days	120 Days	667 Days	728 Days	172 Days
Louisiana	Yes	3 Days	356 Days	309 Days	652 Days	1,156 Days	327 Days
Maine	N/A	3-5 Days	3-4 Months	6-8 Months	3-4 Months	6-8 Months	4-6 Months
Maryland	Yes	20 Days	120 Days	10 Months	N/A	18-24 Months	30 Days

\* = Estimated.

<sup>1</sup>Alaska: Average consists of 200 days for 2 cases closed by disbarment; 1,552 days for 5 cases closed by suspension; 632 days for 1 case closed by public censure; and 975 days for 1 case closed by public reprimand.

<sup>2</sup>Georgia: Suspensions only.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
Massachusetts	N/A	8 Days	260 Days	672 Days	742 Days	1,288 Days	352 Days
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7 Months
Minnesota	N/A	1 Month	7 Months	N/A	13 Months	22 Months	6 Months
Mississippi	N/A	90 Days	90 Days	180 Days	90 Days	90 Days	270 Days
Montana	N/A	2-3 Days	6 Months	10 Months	7-8 Months	18 Months	18 Months
Nebraska	N/A	1-2 Days	30-60 Days	3-6 Months	4-7 Months	1-2 Years	7 Months
Nevada	Yes	1-4 Weeks*	30-60 Days* 45-90 Days	60-120 Days*	60-90 Days*	Uncontested 4-9 Months <sup>3</sup> Contested 9-12 Months*	60-90 Days
New Mexico	N/A	1 Month*	1 Month*	6 Months*	1 Year*	1 Year*	6 Months - 1 Year*
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	N/A	14 Days	5 Months	24 Months	21 Months	N/A	5 Months
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	N/A	2 Weeks	8 Months	8 Months - 1 Year	8 Months	12 - 18 Months	12 - 18 Months
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	N/A	1 Week	9 Months - 1 Year	Varies	9 Months - 1 Year	Varies	Varies
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	N/A	3 Weeks	6 Months	1 Year	Varies	Varies	Varies
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	N/A	90 Days	120 Days	180 Days	120 Days	6 Months - 1 Year	45 Days

\* = Estimated.

<sup>3</sup>Nevada: Dismissed at correspondent level with no grievance file opened, but some investigation: 30-60 days. Dismissed after grievance file is opened and reviewed by a screening panel: 45-90 days.

CHART V

CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data.

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007

ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Time Standards Formally Adopted</u>	<u>Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Private Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time From Receipt of Complaint to Imposition of Public Sanction</u>	<u>Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</u>
New York 4th Jud. Dept. 5th, 7th & 8th Jud. Dist.	N/A	14 Days	90 Days	9 Months	2-6 Months	1 Year	3 Months
North Carolina	N/A	67 Days	281 Days	306 Days	236 Days	412 Days	38 Days
North Dakota	Yes	3 Months*	3 Months*	3 Months*	3 Months*	3 Months*	6 Months*
Ohio	Yes	4 Weeks*	60-150 Days*	150+ Days*	N/A	24 Months*	6 Months if hearing required*.
Oklahoma	N/A	15-20 Days*	120 Days*	150 Days*	130 Days*	12 Months*	9 Months*
Oregon	Yes	8 Days*	100 Days*	250 Days*	N/A	20 Months*	20 Months <sup>4</sup>
Pennsylvania	Yes	7 Days*	48 Days	7 Months*	12.6 Months	17.2 Months	7.4 Months <sup>5</sup>
Rhode Island	N/A	2 Days	90 Days	6 Months	8 Months	10 Months	4 Months
South Carolina	N/A	97 Days	203 Days	519 Days	255 Days	1,435 Days	9 Months
South Dakota	N/A	3-7 Days	80 Days	120-180 Days	150 Days	240 Days	90 Days
Tennessee	N/A	N/A	143 Days	N/A	N/A	N/A	915 Days
Texas	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vermont	N/A	5-10 Days	0-6 Months	0-8 Months	8-12 Months	8-12 Months	4 Months
Washington	N/A	5 Days*	75 Days*	370 Days*	N/A	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	N/A	3 Days*	1 Year*	1 1/2 Years*	N/A	2 Years*	2 Years*
Wisconsin	Yes	52 Days	347 Days	N/A	601 Days	706 Days	301 Days
Wyoming	N/A	2 Days*	3 Weeks*	2 Months*	2 Months*	3 Months*	3 Months*

\* = Estimated.

<sup>4</sup>Oregon: For uncontested matters (reinstatements after inactive status, or after short-term suspension), 60 days. For uncontested matters when applicant has been away from law practice for an extended period or has more extensive disciplinary history, 6 months. For contested matters that are litigated and appealed, average is similar to other discipline cases.

<sup>5</sup>Pennsylvania: Includes from inactive, from discipline and denial of petition for reinstatement.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2006  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
Alabama	14,285	934,295	Included	Included	100% Legislative appropriation.
Alaska	2,913	664,488	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Arkansas	8,500*	675,000*	550,000*	30,000*	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
California	161,437	47,207,000	35,050,000	8,276,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Colorado	21,900	4,621,745	4,182,679	4,390,657	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Connecticut	35,387	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
Delaware	3,435	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
District of Columbia	63,115	5,790,071	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Florida	68,589	10,910,079	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Georgia	31,528	2,160,000	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Hawaii	4,700	1,392,864	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Idaho	3,988	598,757	557,571	41,186	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Illinois	82,380	13,651,541	11,663,175	N/A	92.79% Supreme Court assessed fees; .61% costs recovered and 6.60% interest earned.
Indiana	16,885	1,845,822	1,814,736	31,086	98% Supreme Court assessed fees and 2% Supreme Court general budget.
Iowa	8,578	1,114,743	986,290	128,453	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kansas	10,532	1,232,000	Included	Included	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Kentucky	15,581	1,243,640	Included	0	100% Bar Association General Fund.
Louisiana	20,228	4,646,010	2,885,748	1,760,262	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Maine	4,869	924,762	N/A	N/A	90% Supreme Court assessed fees, 5% MCLE and 5% other funding sources.
Maryland	33,487	4,031,809	Included	0	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.

\*= Estimated.



CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2006  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
Massachusetts	52,143	13,569,652	5,757,510	3,981,853 <sup>1</sup>	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Michigan	37,668	4,476,670	3,503,339	973,331	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Minnesota	25,775	2,585,810	Included	N/A	95% Supreme Court assessed fees; 5% professional firm income, and judgments, client security board income.
Mississippi	8,331	466,582	Included	0	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Missouri	29,343	2,289,114	1,982,134	306,980	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Montana	3,402	344,910	279,186	65,724	74% Bar Association earmarked dues; 26% Supreme Court general budget.
Nebraska	6,381	552,673	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Nevada	6,206	1,100,000	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
New Hampshire	4,531	1,008,426	Included	N/A	92% Supreme Court assessed fees; 8% fees from Character and Fitness Committee.
New Jersey	81,684	10,114,334	6,075,487	1,970,564	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
New Mexico	6,365	840,925	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	88,000	4,117,422	Included	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	13,857	1,400,000	Included	Included	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	13,634	N/A	1,892,138	N/A	100% Legislative appropriation.
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	19,943	N/A	2,179,577	N/A	Office is part of the Appellate Division, Second Department operating budget.
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	9,500	N/A	1,304,611	N/A	100% Attorney Licensing Fund.

<sup>1</sup>Massachusetts: Includes \$740,872 for the lawyer assistance program and \$2,400,00 for Clients' Security Board claims.

CHART VI

STATE BY STATE BUDGET FOR DISCIPLINE, 2007

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2006  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Total No. of Lawyers with Active Licenses</u>	<u>Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative/ Adjudicative Budget (\$)</u>	<u>Source of Funding</u>
New York 4th Jud. Dept. 5th, 7th & 8th Jud. Dist.	13,153	2,005,666	Included	Included	100% Legislative appropriation.
North Carolina	22,222	1,283,043	376,954	906,088	100% Bar earmarked dues.
North Dakota	1,931	358,645 <sup>2</sup>	Included	N/A	51% Legislative Appropriation; 49% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Ohio	41,831	4,698,681	2,211,317	887,364	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Oklahoma	16,027	948,370	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues. <sup>3</sup>
Oregon	13,500	2,460,000	1,868,000 <sup>4</sup>	40,000	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Pennsylvania	60,619	7,560,000	Intergrated <sup>6</sup>	Intergrated <sup>5</sup>	92% Supreme Court assessed fees; 8% assessment of recoup cost of disciplinary sanctions, late payment fees, investments, interest, fees for letters regarding status/disciplinary history.
Rhode Island	8,000	992,682	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
South Carolina	8,200	1,130,754	Included	N/A	43% Legislative appropriation; 57% Other.
South Dakota	2,282	50,000	25,000	N/A	85% budget from non-earmarked dues as needed; 15% comes from state government on contract basis.
Tennessee	18,568	2,316,131	Intergrated <sup>5</sup>	Intergrated <sup>5</sup>	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Texas	80,094	8,456,361	6,478,719	77,010	100% Bar Association General Fund.
Utah	7,245	895,000	Included	N/A	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Vermont	2,000	492,624	300,000	130,000	100% Supreme Court assessed fees.
Virginia	26,937	4,871,175	Included	N/A	100% Mandatory Bar dues.
Washington	26,730	3,737,632	3,554,239	183,393	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
West Virginia	6,169	820,911	Included	Included	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Wisconsin	18,767	2,699,000	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.
Wyoming	1,864	125,000	Included	N/A	100% Bar Association earmarked dues.

<sup>2</sup>North Dakota: July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2009. Includes Judicial Conduct Commission.

<sup>3</sup>Oklahoma: General budget line 19%.

<sup>4</sup>Oregon: \$552,000 Client Assistance Office (intake).

<sup>5</sup>Pennsylvania, Tennessee: Budget of Disciplinary Board and Office of Disciplinary Counsel budget are intergrated.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
Alabama	300
Alaska	540 <sup>1</sup>
Arizona	315 / 460 <sup>2</sup>
Arkansas	20/100 / 175 <sup>3</sup>
California	400 <sup>4</sup>
Colorado	95 / 180 / 225 <sup>5</sup>
Connecticut	560
Delaware	145 / 165 / 225 / 335 <sup>6</sup>
District of Columbia	188
Florida	265
Georgia	230 <sup>7</sup>
Hawaii	150 / 250 <sup>8</sup>
Idaho	55 / 90 / 140 / 255 / 340 <sup>9</sup>
Illinois	0 / 105/ 289 <sup>10</sup>
Indiana	115

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>7</sup>Georgia: \$115 for inactive attorneys.

<sup>8</sup>Hawaii: 0-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>9</sup>Idaho: 72 years or older/less than 1 year in practice and admitted before 7-1-07 /less than 1 year in practice and admitted after 7-1-07/1-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>10</sup>Illinois: Less than 1 year in practice/more than 1 but less than 3 years in practice or inactive/more than 3 years in practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
Iowa	0 / 65 / 140 <sup>11</sup>
Kansas	150
Kentucky	220 / 270 <sup>12</sup>
Louisiana	135 / 200 <sup>13</sup>
Maine	87 / 192 <sup>14</sup>
Maryland	135
Massachusetts	20 / 220 / 300 <sup>15</sup>
Michigan	315
Minnesota	97 / 218 <sup>16</sup>
Mississippi	70 / 130 / 270 <sup>17</sup>
Missouri	140 / 170 / 225 <sup>18</sup>
Montana	285
Nebraska	220 / 320 <sup>19</sup>
Nevada	100 / 250 / 450 <sup>20</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Iowa: 0-1 years in practice/1-5 years in practice/5+ years in practice.

<sup>12</sup>Kentucky: 1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

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

<sup>14</sup>Maine: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice plus \$40 Lawyers Fund For Client Protection fee.

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

<sup>16</sup>Minnesota: Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

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

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

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

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

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
New Hampshire	450 / 495 / <sup>21</sup>
New Jersey	35 / 161 / 186 <sup>22</sup>
New Mexico	265/315 / 365 <sup>23</sup>
New York 1st. Jud. Dept.	350 biennially
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	350 biennially
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	350 biennially
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	350 biennially
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	350 biennially
New York 4th Jud. Dept.	350 biennially
North Carolina	265
North Dakota	325 / 350 / 380 <sup>24</sup>
Ohio	150

<sup>21</sup>New Hampshire: Less than 5 years in practice/ more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>22</sup>New Jersey: Less than 2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/5-49 years in practice.

<sup>23</sup>New Mexico: Less than one year in practice/1-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>24</sup>North Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

CHART VII

ALLOCATION OF DUES AND FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Annual Dues/Fees (\$)</u>
Oklahoma	0 / 137.50 / 275 <sup>25</sup>
Oregon	0 / 110 / 115 / 403 / 482 <sup>26</sup>
Pennsylvania	175
Rhode Island	425 <sup>27</sup>
South Carolina	120 / 120 / 190 <sup>28</sup>
South Dakota	0 / 190 / 315 <sup>29</sup>
Tennessee	105
Texas	0 / 68 / 148 / 235 <sup>30</sup>
Utah	0 / 190 / 350 <sup>31</sup>
Vermont	200
Virginia	250
Washington	203 / 331 / 407 <sup>32</sup>
West Virginia	100 / 200 / 250 <sup>33</sup>
Wisconsin	129
Wyoming	142.50 / 255 <sup>34</sup>

<sup>25</sup>Oklahoma: 1 year in practice/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>26</sup>Oregon: More than 50 years in practice/Inactive/15-50 years in practice/less than 2 years in practice/more than 2 years in practice.

<sup>27</sup>Rhode Island: \$225 mandatory bar dues and \$200 annual court registration.

<sup>28</sup>South Carolina: Inactive/Less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>29</sup>South Dakota: Less than one year in practice/1-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>30</sup>Texas: 70 years or older/0-3 years in practice/3-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>31</sup>Utah: More than 50 years in practice/less than 3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>32</sup>Washington: 1-2 years in practice/3-4 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

<sup>33</sup>West Virginia: Inactive/0-3 years in practice/more than 3 years in practice.

<sup>34</sup>Wyoming: 1-5 years in practice/more than 5 years in practice.

CHART VIII

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

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers</u>	<u>Investigators</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Auditors</u>	<u>Probation Monitors</u>	<u>Other Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>
Alabama	1	3	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	11
Alaska	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	7
Arizona	1	12	3 <sup>1</sup>	2	3.5	10	0	1.5	0	0	30
Arkansas	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
California	1	8	60	54	34	63	15	0	4	2 <sup>2</sup>	241
Colorado	1	2	12	6	0	12	0	0	1	3 <sup>3</sup>	37
Connecticut	1	2;1	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	5;1
Delaware	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	0;1 <sup>4</sup>	1	0	7;1
District of Columbia	1	11	3	2	0	9;1	6	0	0	2 <sup>5</sup>	34;1
Florida	1	40 <sup>6</sup>	0	0;15	11	49;4	0	5	2 <sup>7</sup>	0	108;19
Georgia	1	7	2	0;2	9;1	0	0	0	0	1 <sup>8</sup>	20;3
Hawaii	1	5	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	13
Idaho	1	2	0	2	0	2	0;1	0	0	0	7;1
Illinois	1	36.9	2;1	11.2	13.6	15	0;4	0	0.5	2.6	81.8;5
Indiana	1	0	9;1	1	0	3	0;3	0	0	0	14;4
Iowa	1	3;8	0	2	0;6	2	0	0	0	0	8; 1.4
Kansas	1	3	1	2	0	3	1	0;1	0	0	11;1
Kentucky	1	8	0	0	5	9.5	0	0	0	0	23.5
Louisiana	1	11	0	6	0	15	0	0	0	0	33

<sup>1</sup>Arizona: Intake bar counsel.

<sup>2</sup>California: Management.

<sup>3</sup>Colorado: Controller, Bookkeeper, Computer Tech.

<sup>4</sup>Delaware: Paid by Lawyers Fund for Client Protection.

<sup>5</sup>District of Columbia: Case Managers.

<sup>6</sup>Florida: Includes consumer assistance program attorneys.

<sup>7</sup>Florida: Includes legal assistants.

<sup>8</sup>Georgia: Clerk of State Disciplinary Board.

CHART VIII

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

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers</u>	<u>Investigators</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Auditors</u>	<u>Probation Monitors</u>	<u>Other Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>
Maine	1	2	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	10
Maryland	1	1	8	6	2	11	0	0	0	0	29
Massachusetts	1	19	0	2	14;1	12;2	2	0	0	1 <sup>9</sup>	51;3
Michigan	1	12;2	0	3	0	13	0	0	0	1 <sup>10</sup>	30;2
Minnesota	1	1	8	0	4;1	9	0;1	0	0	0	23;2
Mississippi	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Missouri	1	6	3.5	0	2	6;1	0	0	0	0;2	18.5;3
Montana	1	0	0	1	1	1;2	0;1	0	0	0	4;3
Nebraska	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Nevada	1	3	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	11
New Hampshire	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
New Jersey	1	9.5	1.5	22	1	20	0;2	5	0	3 <sup>11</sup>	63;2
New Mexico	1	3;1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0;3 <sup>12</sup>	7;4
New York 1st Jud. Dept.	1	20;1	0	6	6	11	0;1	1	N/A	2 <sup>13</sup>	47;2
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 2nd & 11th Jud. Dist.	1	8;2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0	0	17;2
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	1	9	0	1	0	4;4	0	1	0	0	16;4
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	1	2	6;2 <sup>14</sup>	3	0	6;1	0	0	0	0	18;3

<sup>9</sup>Massachusetts: Technology Specialist.

<sup>10</sup>Michigan: Computer Analyst.

<sup>11</sup>New Jersey: 2 Information Technology and 1 Law Office Administrator.

<sup>12</sup>New Mexico: 2 Contract Computer Specialists and 1 Contract Lawyer.

<sup>13</sup>New York, 1st Judicial Department: 1 Computer Intake and 1 Computer Programmer.

<sup>14</sup>New York, 2nd Judicial Department/10th Judicial District: Due to leave and vacancies, 3 individuals filled approximately 2 positions.



CHART VIII

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

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Chief Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Disciplinary Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers</u>	<u>Investigators</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Auditors</u>	<u>Probation Monitors</u>	<u>Other Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	1	5	0	0	0	7	0.5	0	0	0	15.5
New York 4th Jud. Dept. 5th, 7th & 8th Jud. Dist.	1	6	1;1	6	0	6;3	0;1	0	0	0	20;5
North Carolina	1	9;1	0	10	5	3	0	1	0	6	35;1
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
Ohio: Disciplinary Counsel's Office	1	1	7	2 <sup>15</sup> ;33	2	8	0;.67	0	0	0	21;1
Oklahoma	1	4	0	4	0	4	0;2	0	0	0	13;2
Oregon <sup>16</sup>	1	6; .5	0	0;.6	0;.6	6	0	0	0	0	13;1.7
Pennsylvania	1	1	26	5	0	17;1	0	4;1	0	0	54;2
Rhode Island	1	1	2	1	0	3;1	0	0	0	0	8;1
South Carolina	1	2	7	2	1	4	0	0	0	1 <sup>17</sup>	18
South Dakota	0;1	0;1	0;1	0	0	0;0.5	0	0	0	0	0;3.5
Tennessee	1	8	0	0	0	10;1	0	0	0	0	19;1
Texas	1	30	0	12	25	12	0	0	1	4 <sup>18</sup>	85
Utah	1	5	0	0	2	2	0;1	0	0	0	10;1
Vermont	1	0	1	0	0	0;.5	0	0	0	0	2;.5
Virginia	1	11	7	9	3	8	0	0	0	0	39
Washington	1	13;3.1	0	4	5	8	0	0	0	0	31;3.1
West Virginia	1	3 <sup>19</sup>	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Wisconsin	1	3	2	11;3	2	5;3	1	0	0	0	25;6
Wyoming	0;1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1;1

<sup>15</sup>Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel also hires the services of 2 private, part-time investigators as paid independent contractors. They are not included in this chart.

<sup>16</sup>Oregon: Does not include Client Assistance Office (intake) staff.

<sup>17</sup>South Carolina: Court reporter.

<sup>18</sup>Texas: Office managers.

<sup>19</sup>West Virginia: Currently only two filled.

CHART IX

STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICE

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Nonlawyer Head of Office</u>	<u>Chief Adjudicative Counsel</u>	<u>Other Adjudicative Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers on Staff</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Other Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>	<u>% Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte./ Trial Level</u>	<u>% Nonlawyer Members at Appellate/ Board Level</u>
Alaska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.0%	25.0%
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	33.0%
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.6%	N/A
California	N/A	1	1	7	12	7	0	7 <sup>1</sup>	35	0.0%	0.0%
Colorado	N/A	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	33.0%	N/A
Connecticut	0	1	1	2;4	1	5;2	0	0	10;6	33.0%	N/A
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	33.0%
District of Columbia	0	1	2	1	0	2	1;2	2 <sup>2</sup>	9;2	33.0%	33.0%
Hawaii	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.0%	28.0%
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0;1	0	0	0;1	33.3%	N/A
Illinois	1	0;1	2	0	0	6	0	0;4	9;5	30.0%	0.0%
Indiana	0	0	0	0;1	0	0	0	0	0;1	N/A	N/A
Iowa	0	0;.25	0	0	0	0;.65	0	0	0;.9	20.0%	N/A
Kentucky	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.0%
Louisiana	1	1	3	0	1	13;1	0	0	19;1	33.0%	33.0%
Massachusetts	1	1	5	0	0	5	0	8 <sup>3</sup>	20	33.3%	33.0%
Michigan	0	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	7	0.0%	33.3%
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	39.0%	N/A
Missouri	0	0	0	1;1	0	1	0	2;1	4;1	33.0%	25.0%
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0;2	0	0	0;2	36.0%	N/A
Nebraska	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3%	33.3%
New Hampshire	0	1	2	0	0	4	0	0	7	40.0%	25.0%

<sup>1</sup>California: 5 State Bar Judges; 2 Management.

<sup>2</sup>District of Columbia: Case Manager and Assistant Case Manager.

<sup>3</sup>Massachusetts: 3 IT, 4 registration staff, and 1 bookkeeper.

CHART IX

STATE-BY-STATE STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICE

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data

Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems, 2007  
ABA Center for Professional Responsibility

<u>STATE</u>	<u>Nonlawyer Head of Office</u>	<u>Chief Adjudicative Counsel</u>	<u>Other Adjudicative Counsel</u>	<u>Other Lawyers on Staff</u>	<u>Legal Assistants/ Paralegals</u>	<u>Secretarial/ Clerical/ Admin.</u>	<u>Law Students/ Clerks</u>	<u>Other Staff</u>	<u>Total Paid Staff</u>	<u>% Nonlawyer Members at Hearing Cte./ Trial Level</u>	<u>% Nonlawyer Members at Appellate/ Board Level</u>
New Jersey	0	1	1	5	3	6	0	1 <sup>4</sup>	17	22.0%	33.3%
New Mexico	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	16.0%
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 9th Jud. Dist.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	N/A
New York 2nd Jud. Dept. 10th Jud. Dist.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.0%	N/A
New York 3rd Jud. Dept.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	N/A
New York 4th Jud. Dept. 5th, 7th & 8th Jud. Dist.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.0%	N/A
North Carolina	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.0%	N/A
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	N/A
Ohio: Board of Commissioners	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	5	33.0%	14.0%
Oregon	0	0	0	0;.05 <sup>5</sup>	0	0;.25	0	0	0;.30	33.0%	0.0%
Pennsylvania	1	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	11	0.0%	12.5%
Rhode Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	33.0%
Tennessee	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	33.0%
Texas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0% <sup>6</sup>	0.0%
Utah	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24.0%	0.0%
Vermont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	N/A
Washington	0	0.5	0	0	0.15	1	0	0	1.65	0.0%	28.0%
West Virginia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.0%	0.0%
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.6%	0.0%

<sup>4</sup>New Jersey: IT Analyst

<sup>5</sup>Oregon: Normal assistance provided by Bar's general counsel.

<sup>6</sup>Hearing Committee not under Texas Board of Disciplinary Appeals.