

## 2019 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)



Prepared by the Standing Committee on Professional Regulation  
of the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION**  
**2019 COMMITTEE ROSTER**

**Hon. Dolores Dorsainvil, Chair**  
Upper Marlboro, MD

**Hon. Daniel J. Crothers**  
Bismark, ND

**Shawn M. Harpen**  
Las Vegas, NV

**Amanda Jones**  
New Haven, CT

**Robert E. Lutz, II**  
Los Angeles, CA

**Nancy Jane Marshall**  
New Orleans, LA

**Sari Montgomery**  
Chicago, IL

**Hon. Michael Oths**  
Boise, ID

**Sharon E. Pandak**  
Woodbridge, VA

**Lea Gutierrez**  
**Special Advisor**  
Chicago, IL

**Charles J. Vigil, Liaison**  
**ABA Board of Governors**  
Albuquerque, NM

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

**Denise M. Quinterri**  
**Association of Professional Responsibility**  
**Lawyers**  
Phoenix, AZ

**Wendy J. Muchman**  
**National Organization of Bar Counsel**  
Chicago, IL

*Center for Professional Responsibility Staff*  
*Teresa Schmid, Director*  
*Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation & Global Initiatives Counsel*  
*Shawna Miller, Program Assistant*

## Introduction to the 2019 S.O.L.D. Results

The ABA Standing Committee on Professional Regulation greatly appreciates the participation of U.S. lawyer disciplinary agencies in the ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.). The S.O.L.D. questionnaire for 2019 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia did not provide responses by the publication date. At the request of the State Bar of California, please derive data from these [public sources](#). The questionnaire is attached at the end of the survey.

The 2019 Survey results consist of ten charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction. Responses correspond to the questions as numbered on the questionnaire appended to the end of this document. Notes ("N") at the end of each chart include explanatory information provided by some jurisdictions. Where exact figures were not available, estimated figures were provided. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data is not available or applicable. Medians and averages are shown where potentially meaningful. Please note, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Questions regarding the survey and questionnaire should be addressed via email to Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation and Global Initiatives Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility at [Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org](mailto:Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org).

## **2019 S.O.L.D. Results**

The information contained in the 2019 S.O.L.D. is not intended to constitute a comprehensive overview of each jurisdiction's lawyer disciplinary system. Where possible, footnotes have been included to address variations in the manner of which jurisdictions function and maintain statistics. [Click here](#) for lawyer disciplinary agency contact information. Additional data about lawyers and the legal profession can be viewed at [Legal Profession Statistics](#).

**Chart I** Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload Volume, Parts A & B

**Chart II** Diversion

**Chart III** Sanctions Imposed, Parts A & B

**Chart IV** Reinstatement / Readmission Statistics

**Chart V** Caseload Statistics

**Chart VI** Case Processing Times

**Chart VII** Budget and Sources of Funding

**Chart VIII** Annual Registration Dues & Fees in State Disciplinary Systems

**Chart IX** Staffing of Disciplinary Counsel Offices, Part A & B

**Chart X** Staffing of Adjudicative Offices, Parts A - C

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I - PART A  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>1. # of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</b>	<b>2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program</b>
Alabama	14,054	1,374	Yes	0
Alaska	3,096	212	No	N/A
Arizona	18,923	2,874	Yes	N/A
Arkansas	9,493	607	N/A	0
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Colorado	27, 255	3,400	Yes	N/A
Connecticut	33,328	810	No	N/A
Delaware	3,652	168	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	80,256	1,147	No	N/A
Florida	90,784	3,557	Yes	1,348
Georgia	39,892	2,150	Yes	13,502
Hawai'i	4,955	464	No	N/A
Idaho	5,284	428	N/A	N/A
Illinois	73,787	4,937	Yes	N/A
Indiana	18,608	1,414	N/A	N/A
Iowa	9,700	818	No	N/A
Kansas	11,094	908	No	N/A
Kentucky	18, 977	1,057	N/A	127
Louisiana	22,679	1,856	Yes	0
Maine	5,357	194	Yes	N/A
Maryland	40,393	1,657	No	N/A

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I - PART A  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>1. # of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</b>	<b>2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program</b>
Michigan	42,502	N/A <sup>N</sup>	Yes	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Minnesota	25,800	1,003	No	N/A
Mississippi	8,780	417	Yes	671
Missouri	30,942	1,733	Yes	N/A
Montana	4,035	293	No	N/A
Nebraska	6,711	422	N/A	N/A
Nevada	9,139	1,700	Yes	70
New Hampshire	5,541	186	No	N/A
New Mexico	7,572	667	No	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	19,315	1,926	No	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	16,191	941	No	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	23,285	2,398	Yes	N/A
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	14,912	1,803	No	N/A
North Carolina	29,267	1,258	Yes	12,383
North Dakota	3,101	156	No	N/A

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I -PART A  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>1. # of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency</b>	<b>2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program</b>	<b>2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program</b>
Ohio	43,681	2,531	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	18, 240	1,041	No	N/A
Oregon	15,218	329	Yes	1,718
Pennsylvania	65,252	4,201	Yes	N/A
Rhode Island	5,085*	328	No	N/A
Tennessee	23,110	1,242	Yes	2,278
Texas	105,125	7,505	Yes	1,016
Utah	9,870	897	Yes	567
Virginia	32,870	3,123	Yes	N/A
Washington	32,573	1,905	Yes	N/A
Wisconsin	25,300	1,518	Yes	N/A
Wyoming	2,999	161	Yes	N/A
<b>* = Estimated</b>				
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,120,766</b>	<b>69,716</b>		<b>33,680</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>24,906</b>	<b>1,483</b>		<b>717</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>18,608</b>	<b>1,057</b>		<b>0</b>

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
 CHART I - PART A  
 LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

CHART I – PART A NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1<sup>st</sup> Department, New York: 3<sup>rd</sup> Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Michigan	Q2: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q2b: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I - PART B  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>3. # of Complaints Pending From Prior Years</b>	<b>4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out</b>	<b>5. # of Complaints Investigated</b>	<b>6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation</b>	<b>7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</b>
Alabama	297	974	298	45	9
Alaska	119	194	84	7	1
Arizona	574	2,435	862	327	64
Arkansas	596	N/A	557	432	31
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	342	0*	276*	125	56
Connecticut	N/A	172	N/A	N/A	148
Delaware	54	N/A	116	144	9
District of Columbia	374	832	689	496	21
Florida	2,379	694	5,936	2,932	244
Georgia	489	1,444	2,150	1,911	34
Hawai'i	125	188	362	N/A	9
Idaho	240	0	668	340	23
Illinois	1,964	1,147	4,802	4,802	3,633
Indiana	34	1,285	337	282	28
Iowa	314	482	650	401	35
Kansas	N/A	460	193	105	36
Kentucky	127	814	293	198	53
Louisiana	1,371	1,121	2,082	649	123
Maine	68	99 <sup>N</sup>	128	84	17
Maryland	N/A	83*	2,000*	1,722*	46*
Michigan	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I - PART B  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</b>	<b>4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out</b>	<b>5. # of Complaints Investigated</b>	<b>6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation</b>	<b>7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</b>
Minnesota	509	437	1,074	253	35
Mississippi	42	359	40	2	15
Missouri	311	913	1,164	482	35
Montana	244	62	222	222	14
Nebraska	102	192	332	201	6
Nevada	85	1,443	257	31	53
New Hampshire	43	161	29	9	16
New Mexico	82	N/A	640	621	7
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	1,313	1,476	1,778	98	33
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	817	380	700	595	60
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	985	729	1,391	566	47
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	358	929	1,127	438	12
North Carolina	679	469 <sup>N</sup>	745	653	52
North Dakota	68	86	55	46	4
Ohio	642	1,398	1,983	1,025	65
Oklahoma	147	N/A	359	299	52

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART I - PART B  
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years</b>	<b>4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out</b>	<b>5. # of Complaints Investigated</b>	<b>6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation</b>	<b>7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination</b>
Oregon	276	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	122	62
Pennsylvania	1,420	819	4,802	2,894	179
Rhode Island	N/A	77	222	214	2
Tennessee	426	511	664	508	104
Texas	180	5,123	2,202	1,705	48
Utah	650	314	1,222	836	45
Virginia	344	2,626	487	355	N/A
Washington	611	937	1,115	772	58
Wisconsin	465	1,070	344	57	22
Wyoming	15	62	205	146	6
<b>* = Estimated</b>					
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>20,279</b>	<b>32,997</b>	<b>45,642</b>	<b>27,870</b>	<b>5,652</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>35</b>

CHART I – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1<sup>st</sup> Department, New York: 3<sup>rd</sup> Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Maine	Q4: 6 Grievance Commission, 93 Central Intake Office = 99 total.
Michigan	Q3: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q4: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q5: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q6: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q7: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
North Carolina	Q4: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
Oregon	Q4: This data is not tracked.
Oregon	Q5: This data is not tracked.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART II- DIVERSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>8a. Yes, there is a program, but Data is Not Maintained</b>	<b>9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program</b>	<b>9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program</b>	<b>9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program</b>
Alabama	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona	Yes	N/A	112	41	3	68
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	Yes	N/A	74 <sup>N</sup>	56	2	16
Connecticut	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delaware	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida	Yes	N/A	140	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	Yes	N/A	2	2	0	2
Idaho	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Illinois	Yes	N/A	7	6	1	8
Indiana	Yes*	Yes	28	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	Yes	N/A	5	3	2	0

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART II- DIVERSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>8a. There is a program, but Data is Not Maintained</b>	<b>9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program</b>	<b>9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program</b>	<b>9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program</b>
Kansas	Yes	N/A	19	19	0	16
Kentucky	Yes	N/A	73	58	19	0
Louisiana	Yes	N/A	9	3	0	6
Maine	Yes	N/A	4	0	0	4
Maryland	Yes	N/A	9	5 <sup>N</sup>	0	17
Michigan	Yes	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	Yes <sup>N</sup>	N/A	4	0	3	1
Missouri	Yes	N/A	7	3	N/A	4
Montana	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	Yes	N/A	6	6	N/A	0
Nevada	Yes	33	33	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	Yes	N/A	2	0	0	2
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	2	N/A	N/A	2

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART II- DIVERSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>8a. There is a program, but Data is Not Maintained</b>	<b>9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program</b>	<b>9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program</b>	<b>9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program</b>
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	Yes	N/A	0	0	0	0
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	Yes	N/A	5	2	1	2
North Carolina	Yes <sup>N</sup>	N/A	13	7	0	27
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	Yes	N/A	26	12	0	14
Oregon	Yes	N/A	15 <sup>N</sup>	7	0	8
Pennsylvania	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	Yes	N/A	41	41	0	0

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART II- DIVERSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>8a. There is a program, but Data is Not Maintained</b>	<b>9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program</b>	<b>9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program</b>	<b>9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program</b>	<b>9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program</b>
Texas	Yes	N/A	100	86	5	9
Utah	Yes	N/A	15	15	N/A	N/A
Washington	Yes	N/A	19	5	0	14
Wisconsin	Yes	N/A	31	11	0	20
Wyoming	Yes	N/A	3	3	0	0

**\* = Estimated**



CHART II –NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**Not all jurisdictions maintain this data and therefore the following jurisdictions are not included in this chart: Ohio and Virginia.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Colorado	Q9: Intake: 31, Investigative: 42, Trial: 1
Indiana	Q8: JLAP & Trust Account School
Maryland	Q9a: Includes prior FY.
Michigan	Q9: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q9a: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q9b: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q9c: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Mississippi	Q8: Lawyers & Judges Assistance Program ("LJAP").

CHART II –NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

***Not all jurisdictions maintain this data and therefore the following jurisdictions are not included in this chart: Ohio and Virginia.***

***Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).***

New York: 2nd Department 9th District	Q9a: Data not tracked.
New York: 2nd Department 9th District	Q9b: Data not tracked.
New York: 2nd Department 9th District	Q9c: Data not tracked.
North Carolina	Q8: Successful completion of the diversion program may but does NOT necessarily result in Dismissal of the grievance
Oregon	Q9: 1 in diversion, 14 in probation.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART A  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions</b>	<b>10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition</b>	<b>10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand</b>	<b>10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)</b>
Alabama	17	0	17	22
Alaska	0	0	0	N/A
Arizona <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	2	N/A	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	8	8	0	170
Connecticut <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Delaware	5	5	0	0
District of Columbia <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida	N/A <sup>N</sup>	4	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Georgia	54	12	13	29
Hawai'i	17	17	1	18
Idaho	13	1	12	N/A
Illinois <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indiana	19	1	1	17
Iowa	99	99	N/A	18
Kansas	0	14	0	38
Kentucky	80	47	3	30
Louisiana	27	26	1	0

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART A  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions</b>	<b>10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition</b>	<b>10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand</b>	<b>10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)</b>
Maine	14	14	0	0
Maryland <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	47 <sup>N</sup>
Michigan <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Minnesota	121	107	0	14 <sup>N</sup>
Mississippi	44	14	8	22
Missouri	N/A	64 <sup>N</sup>	N/A	130 <sup>N</sup>
Montana <sup>N</sup>	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	5	N/A	5	N/A
Nevada	32	N/A	1	30
New Hampshire <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	6	4	6	38
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	278	23	N/A	255
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	64	64	0	132
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	308	60	0	248

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART A  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions</b>	<b>10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition</b>	<b>10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand</b>	<b>10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)</b>
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	19	19	N/A	98*
North Carolina	113	37	0	76
North Dakota	9	5	N/A	10
Ohio <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	67	41	26	N/A
Oregon <sup>N</sup>	N/A	34	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	399	68	17	314
Rhode Island	27	7	2	18
Tennessee	100	30	29	0
Texas	106	N/A	106	N/A
Utah	5	5	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Virginia	42	24	16	2
Washington	2	N/A	N/A	2
Wisconsin	18	0	18	0
Wyoming	4	0	4	0
<b>* = Estimated</b>				
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2,124</b>	<b>854</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>1,778</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

CHART III – PART A NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions responded that they do not have private/non-public discipline: Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Oregon.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Arkansas	Q10c: 2 warnings
Maryland	Q10: A warning in Maryland is not a sanction.
Maryland	Q10c: Not considered a sanction.
Michigan	Q10: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q10a: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q10c: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Minnesota	Q10c: Private probation.
Missouri	Q10a & 10c: Admonitions and Guidance Letters are not private.

CHART III – PART A NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions responded that they do not have private/non-public discipline: Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Oregon.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

New York: 4th Department 5th, 7th & 8th Districts	Q10c: a "Letter of Advisement" is non-disciplinary pursuant to Appellate Division, Fourth Department rules.
Utah	10c: Letters of warning/caution are not considered discipline.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART B  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined</b>	<b>11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred</b>	<b>11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent</b>	<b>11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</b>	<b>11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)</b>	<b>11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured</b>	<b>11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation</b>	<b>11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution</b>	<b>11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs</b>
Alabama	96	14	1	45	0	29	7	N/A	113
Alaska	1	0	N/A	0	0	1	0	0	0
Arizona	111	9	9	34	2	21	48	3	114
Arkansas	21	0	9	5	2	6	0	0	N/A
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	65	9	6	35	6	16	18	3	67
Connecticut	42	1	0	25	8	13	2	1	0
Delaware	7	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	55	13	4	27	46	11	6	2	N/A
Florida	242	79	3	104	8	63	24	N/A	N/A
Georgia	41	22	N/A	3	15	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	5	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	5
Idaho	8	0	1	4	0	14	4	0	0

**\* = Estimated**



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART B  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
Illinois	96	15	14	48	7	6	13	7	96
Indiana	38	2	0	28	2	1	8	N/A	28
Iowa	61	4	2	19	0	39	N/A	N/A	22
Kansas	22	2	1	3	1	15	1	N/A	11
Kentucky	22	2	0	14	3	5	1	4	17
Louisiana	126	14	8	45	17	8	33	N/A	126
Maine	16	1	0	4 <sup>N</sup>	0	10 <sup>N</sup>	1 <sup>N</sup>	0	0
Maryland	77	14	12	20	1	30	N/A	N/A	17
Michigan	86	12 <sup>N</sup>	6	43	23	25 <sup>N</sup>	14	22	86
Minnesota	35	3	2	22	0	4	4	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	20	5	0	8	0	7	0	0	18
Missouri	54	15	7	18	4	1	10	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Montana	12	3	0	3	0	4	0	4	8
Nebraska	5	2	2	1	0	0	1	N/A	5

\* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART B  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined</b>	<b>11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred</b>	<b>11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent</b>	<b>11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</b>	<b>11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)</b>	<b>11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured</b>	<b>11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation</b>	<b>11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution</b>	<b>11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs</b>
Nevada	24	6	0	23	N/A	N/A	33	N/A	51
New Hampshire	18	2	1	4	4	11	3	N/A	18
New Mexico	8	3	4	5	1	4	4	1	5
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	34	12	5	7	6	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	16	8	1	4	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	36	15	1	13	2	5	N/A	0	0

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART B  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined</b>	<b>11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred</b>	<b>11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent</b>	<b>11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)</b>	<b>11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)</b>	<b>11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured</b>	<b>11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation</b>	<b>11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution</b>	<b>11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs</b>
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	20	6	2	11	1	0	N/A	0	N/A
North Carolina	89	5	12	15	5	84	8	0	89
North Dakota	5	1	N/A	1	0	3	0	0	N/A
Ohio	66	1	12	18	20	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	12	1	4	7	5	0	0	0	12
Oregon	63	4	3	34	1	34	14	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	93	24	7	54	6	70	3	N/A	184
Rhode Island	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	58	16	1	17	10	14	11	13	58

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART III- PART B  
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
Texas	211	21	9	142	0	39	N/A <sup>N</sup>	81	238
Utah	29	4	6	8	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
Virginia	67	7	10	20	N/A	30	N/A	N/A	67
Washington	56	9	8	20	13	19	19	17	39
Wisconsin	30	1	1	20	N/A	8	N/A	7	15
Wyoming	6	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	6
* = Estimated									
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2,308</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>674</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>114,313</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2,432</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>

CHART III – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Maine	Q11c: Includes 1 disability suspension.
Maine	Q11e: 7 Reprimands, 3 admonitions (public Dismissal w/Warning).
Maine	Q11f: Monitoring.
Michigan	11a: Adjudicated.
Michigan	11e: Reprimands
Missouri	Q11h: Costs in disciplinary matters are taxed in the same manner as costs in civil proceedings. In addition to such costs, a fee is imposed by the Missouri Supreme Court. Reprimand \$750; Reprimand with Requirements \$1,000; Suspension \$1,000; Probation \$1,500; Disbarment \$2,000. See <a href="#">Missouri Supreme Court Rule 5.19 (h)</a> .
Texas	11f: Included in suspensions.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed</b>	<b>13a. # Granted After Disbarment</b>	<b>13b. # Granted After Suspension</b>	<b>13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status</b>	<b>14. # Denied / Dismissed</b>
Alabama	6	1	5	0	1
Alaska	3	0	1	0	0
Arizona	4	0	4	0	4
Arkansas	7	0	0	0	0
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	5	0	2	0	2
Connecticut	2	1	1	0	N/A
Delaware	2	0	1	0	1
District of Columbia	12	5	7	0	6
Florida	23	0	11	0	12
Georgia	4	N/A	4	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	1	0	1	0	0
Idaho	3	0	3	0	0
Illinois	6	0	1	0	5
Indiana	5	0	N/A	N/A	3
Iowa	4	0	4	0	0
Kansas	3	3	3	1	0
Kentucky	11	0	2	0	1

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed</b>	<b>13a. # Granted After Disbarment</b>	<b>13b. # Granted After Suspension</b>	<b>13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status</b>	<b>14. # Denied / Dismissed</b>
Louisiana	8	9	26	3	0
Maine	4 <sup>N</sup>	0	0	0	0
Maryland	18	0	8	0	10
Michigan	11	2	6	0	1
Minnesota	13	0	9	0	1
Mississippi	4	0	0	0	0
Missouri	142 <sup>N</sup>	N/A	110	N/A	14
Montana	1	0	1	0	0
Nebraska	1	1	0	8	0
Nevada	4	0	4	2	0
New Hampshire	1	0	1	0	1
New Mexico	3	0	3	0	0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	13	3	4	N/A	6
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	3	1	0	0	2
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	19	6	11	0	6

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed</b>	<b>13a. # Granted After Disbarment</b>	<b>13b. # Granted After Suspension</b>	<b>13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status</b>	<b>14. # Denied / Dismissed</b>
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	4	2	2	N/A	0
North Carolina	9	0	1	2	6
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	9	N/A	12	N/A	0
Oklahoma	3	0	0	2	3
Oregon	327	N/A <sup>N</sup>	11	1	1
Pennsylvania	15	2	10	0	2
Rhode Island	24	0	3	N/A	0
Tennessee	10	0	8	1	1
Texas	10	3	31	0	0
Utah	7	N/A	1	N/A	2
Virginia	1	0	N/A	5	1
Washington	19	0	15	0	1
Wisconsin	39	1	1	0	7
Wyoming	0	0	0	1	0
<b>* = Estimated</b>					
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>



CHART IV NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).**

Maine	Q12: All administratively reinstated.
Missouri	Q12: 99 of the 142 reinstatements were Return to Active Status Reinstatements. Those individuals apply for reinstatement under <a href="#">Missouri Supreme Court Rule 6.06</a> but have not been suspended or disbarred. In 2019, 87 of the 99 applicants returned to active status. 9 applications were dismissed and 1 was still pending at the end of 2019.
Oregon	13a: Disbarment is permanent.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART V- CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer</b>		<b>16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years</b>		<b>17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</b>		<b>18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer</b>	
Alabama	687		148		687		487	
Arizona <sup>N</sup>	431	108	38	43	393	65	406	41
Arkansas	250		179		149		139	
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Colorado	576	43	N/A		567	43	468	23
Connecticut	64		N/A		64		N/A	
Delaware	50		15		35		35	
District of Columbia	43		23		20		31	
Florida	125		42		75		135	
Georgia	25		25		30		12	
Hawai'i	182		127		99		70	
Idaho	256		89		167		159	
Illinois	140 <sup>N</sup>		140 <sup>N</sup>		800		700	
Iowa	90*		90*		80*		100*	
Kentucky	155		43		112		145	
Louisiana	160		105		54		49	
Maine	N/A <sup>N</sup>		60		N/A <sup>N</sup>		N/A	
Maryland	N/A <sup>N</sup>		N/A <sup>N</sup>		30*		N/A <sup>N</sup>	
Michigan <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>		N/A <sup>N</sup>		N/A <sup>N</sup>		N/A <sup>N</sup>	
Minnesota	33		37		37		34	

\* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART V- CASELOAD VOLUME**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer</b>	<b>16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years</b>	<b>17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer</b>	<b>18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer</b>
Mississippi	139	14	139	120
Montana	273	127	146	142
Nebraska	32	26	56	32
Nevada	18	14	16	N/A
New Mexico	159	27	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	78	91	105	145
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	155	109	266	204
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	161	57	109	101
North Carolina	123	45	83	64
Ohio	73	40	69	86
Oklahoma	59.8	28.0	40.2	29.8
Oregon <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	168	57	192	116
Rhode Island	82	N/A	82	N/A

**\* = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART V- CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer	16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years	17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Tennessee	110	107	183	175
Texas	62	28	34	39
Utah	262	111	151	103
Virginia	44	31	41	22
Washington	92	35	34	73
Wisconsin	108	31	75	76
Wyoming	68	46	161	149
* = Estimated				
<b>AVERAGE*</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>MEDIAN*</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>73</b>

CHART V NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./ 2<sup>nd</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Districts, and North Dakota.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Arizona	Q15: Intake Caseload 431, Litigation Caseload 108 = 539.
Arizona	Q16: Intake Caseload 38, Litigation Caseload 43 = 81.
Arizona	Q17: Intake Caseload 393, Litigation Caseload 65 = 458.
Arizona	Q18: Intake Caseload 406, Litigation Caseload 41 = 447.
Colorado	Q15: Intake Caseload 567, Trial Caseload 43.
Colorado	Q17: Intake Caseload 567, Trial Caseload 43.
Colorado	Q18: Intake Caseload 468, Trial Caseload 23.
Illinois	Q15: Per month.
Illinois	Q16: Per month.
Maine	Q15: Shared caseload among mostly 2 lawyers.
Maine	Q17: Shared caseload.
Maryland	Q17: Docketed cases.

CHART V NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./ 2<sup>nd</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Districts, and North Dakota.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).**

Michigan	Q15: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q16: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q17: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q18: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Oregon	Q15: Information is unavailable; two lawyers transferred & retired last year, and those positions were unfilled until this year.
Oregon	Q16: Information is unavailable; two lawyers transferred & retired last year, and those positions were unfilled until this year.

CHART V NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./ 2<sup>nd</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Districts, and North Dakota.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).**

Oregon	Q17: Information is unavailable; two lawyers transferred & retired last year, and those positions were unfilled until this year.
Oregon	Q18: Information is unavailable; two lawyers transferred & retired last year, and those positions were unfilled until this year.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VI- CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</b>	<b>20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</b>	<b>21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</b>	<b>22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction</b>	<b>22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction</b>	<b>23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</b>
Alabama	N/A	150 days	180 days	240 days	300 days	80 days
Alaska	69.77 days	410 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	47 days
Arizona	22 days	210 days	304 days	N/A <sup>N</sup>	113 days	218 days
California <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado	50 days	279 days	323 days	N/A	177 days	116 days
Georgia	7 days	90 days	220 days	240 days	420 days	90 days
Hawai'i	44 days	332 days	432 days	346 days	479 days	455 days
Idaho	N/A <sup>N</sup>	180 days	240 days	N/A	120 days	60 days
Illinois	Fewer than 10 days	Fewer than 90 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	2-3 days	120 days*	210 days	N/A	270 days*	90 days*
Kansas <sup>N</sup>	14 days	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>
Kentucky	2 days	77 days	112 days	71 days	730 days	320 days
Louisiana	22 days	164 days	372 days	87 days	415 days	468 days

**\* = Estimated**



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
 CHART VI- CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Jurisdiction	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction	22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction	23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Maine	33 days	68 days	93 days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maryland	7-10 days*	120-210 days*	365 days*	N/A	547 days*	60 days*
Michigan	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A	263 days	233 days
Minnesota	20 days	266 days	558 days	N/A	195 days	153 days
Mississippi	90 days	120 days	150 days	90 days	120 days	150 days
Montana	20 days	270 days	120 days	N/A	90 days	90 days
Nebraska	5 days	125 days	275 days	375 days	548 days	548 days
Nevada	30 days	90 days	20 days	120 days <sup>N</sup>	120 days <sup>N</sup>	60 days
New Hampshire	21 days	273 days	302 days	N/A	225 days	385 days
New Mexico	2 days*	18 days*	60 days*	180 days*	240 days*	240 days*
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/9 <sup>th</sup> District	7 days*	270- 365 days	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies

\* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VI- CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal</b>	<b>20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation</b>	<b>21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges</b>	<b>22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction</b>	<b>22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction</b>	<b>23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition</b>
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/10 <sup>th</sup> District	7-14 days	121 -183 days	183-365 days	Varies	Varies	Varies
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Departments/ 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	14 days	90 days	270 days	N/A	90- 270 days	90 days
North Carolina	107 days <sup>N</sup>	256 days	362 days	N/A	203 days	112 days
North Dakota <sup>N</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	69 days	N/A	N/A
Ohio	60 days	213 days	289 days	N/A	793 days	0 days
Oklahoma	45 days	180 days	270 days	N/A	270-365 days*	270-365 days*
Pennsylvania	12 days	86 days	N/A	330 days	420 days	120 days
Rhode Island	2 days	90 days	180 days	90 days	270 days	60 days
Tennessee	1-2 days	160 days	195 Days*	N/A	409 days	57 days
Texas	18 days	120-180 days	141 days	206 days	238 days	N/A

**\* = Estimated**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
 CHART VI- CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Jurisdiction	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction	22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction	23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Virginia	7 days	85 days	454 days	383 days	510 days	N/A
Washington	13 days*	77 days*	335 days*	N/A	274 days*	N/A
Wisconsin	42 days	262 days	N/A	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A
Wyoming	28 days	82 days	151 days	N/A	196 days	N/A

\* = Estimated

#### CHART VI NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Missouri, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Judicial Districts, Oregon, and Utah.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Arizona	Q22a: Arizona does not have any private/non-public sanctions.
Kansas	Q20: Kansas does not track this data.
Kansas	Q21: Kansas does not track this data.
Kansas	Q22a: Kansas does not track this data.
Kansas	Q22b: Kansas does not track this data.
Kansas	Q23: Kansas does not track this data.
Michigan	Q19: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q20: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.
Michigan	Q21: Information not available. The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2019 Questionnaire. The Michigan Attorney Discipline Board did provide data in response to the 2019 Survey.

#### CHART VI NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Missouri, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Judicial Districts, Oregon, and Utah.**

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).**

Nevada	Q22a: <120
Nevada	Q22b: <120
North Carolina	Q19: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
North Dakota	Q19: North Dakota does not track this data.
North Dakota	Q20: North Dakota does not track this data.
North Dakota	Q21: North Dakota does not track this data.
North Dakota	Q22b: North Dakota does not track this data.
North Dakota	Q23: North Dakota does not track this data.
Wisconsin	Q22a & 22b: Varies.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
Alabama	14,054	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	3,096	\$923,548	\$923,548	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Arizona	18,923	\$4,307,309	\$3,726,893	\$580,416	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Arkansas	9,493	\$973,260	\$953,610	\$19,650	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fes	0%
California	N/A	\$44,363,600	\$36,839,000	\$7,524,600	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Colorado	27,255	\$8,147,537.40	\$7,138,190.36	\$1,009,347.04	100% Other	100% (Registration Fees & Attorney Fines)
Connecticut	33,328	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	80,256	\$9,624,541	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%

**\*=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
Florida	90,784	\$16,751,699	\$16,751,699	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Georgia	39,892	\$4,388,494	\$4,388,494	\$50,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Hawai'i	4,955	\$1,776,973	\$1,776,973	\$1,776,973	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Idaho	5,284	\$834,607	\$770,006	\$64,601	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Illinois	73,787	\$17,424,517	\$15,394,631	\$2,029,886	91.3% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8.7% Other (unspecified)
Indiana	18,608	\$2,511,065.17	100%	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Iowa	9,700	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$200,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Kansas	11,094	\$2,056,000	\$2,056,000	\$2,056,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A

**\*=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
Kentucky	18,977	\$1,234,266	\$1,234,266	\$1,234,266	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Louisiana	22,679	\$5,937,779	\$2,794,102	\$3,143,677	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Maine	5,357	\$1,330,000	\$972,000	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Maryland	40,393	\$4,613,921	\$4,613,921	N/A	97% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	3% Bank Interest & recovered costs
Michigan	42,502	\$4,186,532	\$5,306,614	\$1,120,082	97% Bar Association Dues	3% Other (unspecified)
Minnesota	25,800	\$3,969,600	\$3,969,600	N/A	94% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	6% Other (unspecified)
Mississippi	8,780	\$813,358	\$813,358	\$0	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Missouri	30,942	\$3,513,175	\$2,907,502	\$605,603	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Montana	4,035	\$697,000	\$580,000	\$117,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A

**\*=Estimated**



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
Nebraska	6,711	\$586,084	\$586,084	\$0	99% Supreme Court Assessed Fees/.05% Supreme Court General Budget	.05% Pro Hac Vice Fees
Nevada	9,139	\$2,045,400	\$2,045,400	\$1,400,000	49% Bar Association Dues	N/A
New Hampshire	5,541	\$1,170,431	\$1,170,431	\$0	99% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	1% Other (cost reimbursements)
New Mexico	7,572	\$898,333.45	\$898,333.45	\$0	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	19,315	\$1,700,000	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/ 9 <sup>th</sup> District	16,191	\$2,212,351.00	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/ 10 <sup>th</sup> District	23,285	\$2,887,294	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**\*=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department/ 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	14,912	\$2,230,074	\$2,230,074	\$2,230,074	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A
North Carolina	29,267	\$4,277,158.90	\$4,182,382.71	\$94,776.71	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
North Dakota	3,101	\$606,446	\$606,446	N/A	40.6% Bar Association Fees	59.4% Supreme Court Assessed Fees
Ohio	43,681	\$640,667	\$3,206,345	\$830,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Oklahoma	18, 240	\$1,382,835.00	\$0	\$0	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Oregon	15,218	N/A <sup>N</sup>	\$2,403,306	N/A <sup>N</sup>	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Pennsylvania	65,252	\$11,501,776	\$9,148,380	\$2,883,842	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Rhode Island	5,085*	\$933,929.64	\$933,929.64	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A

**\*=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Lawyers with Active License</b>	<b>24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)</b>	<b>25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)</b>	<b>26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)</b>	<b>27. Source of Funding</b>	<b>27e. Other Sources of Funding</b>
Tennessee	23,110	\$4,436,612	\$4,436,612	N/A	96% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	4% Other (cost bills, penalty fees)
Texas	105,125	\$10,533,890	\$9,867,801	\$597,669	N/A	SBOT General Budget
Utah	9,870	\$1,472,840	\$1,472,840	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Virginia	32,870	\$6,621,325	\$5,291,015	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Washington	32,573	\$6,078,648	\$5,788,075	\$290,573	100% Bar Association Dues <sup>N</sup>	N/A
Wisconsin	25,300	\$3,291,200	\$3,291,200	\$3,291,200	92% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8% Other (unspecified)
Wyoming	2,999	\$358,044	\$335,948	\$22,096	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A

**\*=Estimated**

CHART VII NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

***These jurisdictions do not maintain this data, and therefore did not provide a response for this question: Delaware.***

***Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive data for California from these [public sources](#).***

Oregon	Q24: The adjudicative office is part of General Counsel's office.
Oregon	Q26: This is handled as part of the General Counsel's budget.
Washington	Q27: Not earmarked. Less than 2% of the discipline system budget is funded from alternative revenue sources, including recovery of discipline costs, issuance of discipline history certificates, and recovery of revenue for auditor review of trust account records.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

<b>28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:</b>									
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No Tiers Specified</b>	<b>0-1 year</b>	<b>1-2 years</b>	<b>2-3 years</b>	<b>3-4 years</b>	<b>4-5 years</b>	<b>5+ years</b>	<b>Inactive</b>	<b>Other</b>
Alabama	\$350								
Alaska	\$660								70 years old / 25 years of practice = \$335
Arizona		\$345	\$345	\$345	\$505	\$505	\$505		
Arkansas		\$125	\$125	\$125	\$200	\$200	\$200		Age 65+/ retired= \$20
California	\$383								
Colorado		\$190	\$190	\$190	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$130 under 65 years	65 years+/ inactive= \$0
Connecticut	\$140							N/A	Discounted dues of \$110 for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• full-time judges</li> <li>• legal services</li> <li>• government employees</li> <li>• law school faculty</li> </ul>
Delaware		\$174	\$174	\$174	\$174	\$174	\$227		More than 10 Years = \$353
District of Columbia	\$317							\$194	
Florida	\$265								

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Georgia		\$279					\$254		1-4 years a member pays a total of \$279 (Dues plus \$25 in Clients' Security Fund).
Hawai'i		\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$250		
Idaho		See Other	\$320	\$320	\$425	\$425	\$425	\$150	Less than 1 year admitted Jan - June = \$175 / Less than 1 year admitted July - Dec = \$115 72+ years = \$70
Illinois		\$0	\$121	\$121	\$385	\$385	\$385		
Indiana	\$180								
Iowa	\$255								
Kansas	\$175								
Kentucky			\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$310		Members of Judiciary= \$150
Louisiana		\$170	\$170	\$170	\$265	\$265	\$265		50+ years in practice- \$0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Maine		\$160	\$160	\$160	\$265	\$265	\$265		Over 50 Years = \$140 / Judges = \$40
Maryland	\$130								
Michigan	\$315								Active 1-49= \$315 (CPF \$15 + Discipline \$120 + State Bar \$180) Active 50+ = \$135 (CPF -\$15 + Discipline-\$120)
Minnesota		\$114	\$114	\$114	\$248	\$248	\$248		
Mississippi		\$100	\$100	\$175	\$175	\$310	\$335		
Missouri		\$280	\$280	\$280	\$410	\$410	\$410		Non-Resident = \$325
Montana	\$495								
Nebraska	\$95								
Nevada	\$490								
New Hampshire		\$515	\$565	\$565	\$565	\$565	\$565		Newly admitted = \$515 / Active = \$565 / Full-Time Judicial= \$295
New Mexico	\$450								

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	\$375								Biennially
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/9 <sup>th</sup> District	\$375								Biennially
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/ 10 <sup>th</sup> District	\$375								
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department/ 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	\$375								Biennially
North Carolina	\$325								
North Dakota		\$325	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$380		
Ohio	\$175								
Oklahoma		\$137.50	\$137.50	\$137.50	\$275	\$275	\$275		
Oregon		\$470	\$470	\$557	\$557	\$557	\$557		Active/ Pro Bono = \$125
Pennsylvania	\$225								



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

<b>28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:</b>									
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No Tiers Specified</b>	<b>0-1 year</b>	<b>1-2 years</b>	<b>2-3 years</b>	<b>3-4 years</b>	<b>4-5 years</b>	<b>5+ years</b>	<b>Inactive</b>	<b>Other</b>
Rhode Island	\$200								
Tennessee	\$170								
Texas		\$68	\$68	\$68	\$148	\$148	\$235		
Utah <sup>N</sup>		\$255	\$255	\$255	\$430	\$430	\$430		All totals include a \$5 fee for Client Protection Fund.
Virginia	\$250								
Washington		\$226.50	\$226.50	\$453	\$453	\$453	\$453		
Wisconsin		\$280.50	\$280.50	\$280.50	\$491	\$491	\$491		
Wyoming		\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50		6 or more years= \$355

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
 CHART VIII- ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &  
 FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

CHART VIII NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive additional data for California from these [public sources](#).**

South Carolina	Q28: The basic dues are \$275.00 plus \$30 optional indigency services funding plus \$70 mandatory disciplinary system assessment. Less than 3 years= \$190 plus \$30 optional indigent services funding plus \$40 disciplinary assessment. The Supreme Court must approve any changes in the annual assessments. <a href="#">See Rule 410, SC Appellate Court Rules.</a>
Utah	Q28: All totals include a \$5 fee for Client Protection Fund.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART A  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alaska	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	1.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	83.0	0.0	74.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	1.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	10.0 <sup>N</sup>	0.0	1.0	0.0
Connecticut	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Delaware	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	1.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Florida	1.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	10.0	1.0	58.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.25
Hawaii	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Idaho	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	31.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	7.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	20.0	2.0	0.0	2.5
Indiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Iowa	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kansas	1.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	8.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0 <sup>N</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0 <sup>N</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maryland	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	1.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART A  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Minnesota	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.22	0.0	.22	0.0	5.82	0.0	10.53	0.0	.61	0.0
Mississippi	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Montana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0		
Nevada	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department/10 <sup>th</sup> District	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART A  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Oklahoma	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas	1.0	0.0	4.0 <sup>N</sup>	0.0	33.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	1.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	4.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	4.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	0.0	N/A
Virginia	1.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	1.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Wisconsin	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CHART IX NOTES: PART A

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

***The following jurisdiction does not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Michigan.***

***Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive additional data for California from these [public sources](#).***

Maine	Q31: Special Counsel & Board Clerk 32hrs.
Maine	Q34: 2 Assistants to Bar Counsel & 1 office Assistant.
Colorado	Q34: I.C.- 2, Intake Investigator-2, Building Management- 1, Office Manager- 1, Executive Assistant- 1, Payroll- 1 Reception- 1, Outreach and Education Coordinator-1
Texas	Q30: Regional Counsel.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART B  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	11.0	0.0
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Arizona	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Records Department	36.0	0.0
Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	249.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	I.T. (3)	48.0	0.0
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Delaware	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	5.0	0.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	37.0	0.0
Florida	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	120.0	18.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	Receivership Clerk	25	0.75
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	1.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	1.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.0	5.0	Registration (Full-Time)/ I.T (Part-Time)	76.0	11.5
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	16.0	2.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	10.0	0.6
Kansas	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	I.T.	11.0	4.0
Kentucky	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	16.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	29.0	1.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART B  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	Executive Director, CLE Coordinator, & Registration Clerk	10.0	0.0
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Executive secretary & administrative assistant	27.0	0.0
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.43		Judges (full-time) .40/ Accounting (full-time) .03	28.23	0.0
Mississippi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	I.T.	21.0	0.5
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Admin Contractor	6.0	0.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	16.0	0.0
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	9.0	0.7
New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.0	3.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> Districts	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	0.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 9 <sup>th</sup> District	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	1.0
New York: 2 <sup>nd</sup> Department 10 <sup>th</sup> District	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	19.0	1.0
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	19.0	0.0



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART IX- PART B  
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	Attorney/Client Assistance Program	47.0	1.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.0	1.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	25.0	2.0
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	15.0	0.0
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1 Office Manager (Full-Time)/ 2 Regulatory Service Specialists (Full-Time)	14.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	53.0	0.0
Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	I.T. Administrator	34.0	0.0
Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	96.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	12.0	N/A
Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	33.0	0.0
Washington	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Department Admin.	37.0	.30
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	29.0	0.0
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	0.0

CHART IX NOTES: PART B

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

***The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Michigan.***

***Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date.***

**Please derive additional data for California from these [public sources](#).**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART A  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	40. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		41. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		42. Other Adjudicative Counsel		43. Other Lawyers on Staff		44. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		45. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		46. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
California	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Connecticut	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.25 <sup>N</sup>	0.0	0.0
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.23 <sup>*</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.65 <sup>*</sup>	0.0	0.0
Kansas	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Michigan	N/A	N/A	1.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	4.0	N/A	0.0	N/A
Missouri	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Nevada	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART A  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	40. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		41. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		42. Other Adjudicative Counsel		43. Other Lawyers on Staff		44. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		45. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		46. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Oregon	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA	1.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CHART X – PART A NOTES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data and therefore the following jurisdictions did not provide data for this chart: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York: 2nd Dept./9th District, New York: 2nd Dept./10th District, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Districts, New York: 4th Dept./5th, 7th & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

*Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive additional data for California from these [public sources](#).*

Georgia

Q45: clerk of board

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART B  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	47. Other Staff		47. Other Staff Details	48. TOTAL Paid Staff	
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
California	9.0	0.0	2 Management (Full-Time)/ 7 State Bar Judges (Full-Time)	39.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.0	3.0
Connecticut	3.0	0.0	One full time investigator; two full time auditors	13.0	3.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	0.0
Georgia	0.0	0.25	.25 Counsel to review board (independent contractor)	0.0	0.50
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Idaho	1.0	0.0	Clerk of PCB	1.0	0.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	2.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.88*
Kansas	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
Louisiana	6.0	0.0	2 Media Full- Time / 4 Tech Full-Time	17.0	2.0
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.0	N/A
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.5 (Part-Time) I.T.	4.0	1.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	N/A	16.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART B  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	47. Other Staff		47. Other Staff Details	48. TOTAL Paid Staff	
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	IT	17.0	0.0
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.5	0.0
Oregon	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0 <sup>N</sup>	0.0
Pennsylvania	10.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	0.0
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	Court Reporter	5.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Virginia	0.0	0.0	N/A	9.0	0.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.4
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0

CHART X – PART B NOTES

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York: 2nd Dept./9th District, New York: 2nd Dept./10th District, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Districts, New York: 4th Dept./5th, 7th & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

*Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive additional data for California from these [public sources](#).*

Oregon	Q48: Both of these positions are part of the General Counsel's office, not Disciplinary Counsel's Office.
Vermont	Q47: Contract counsel for volunteer hearing panels.



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART C  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level</b>	<b>49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level</b>	<b>49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level</b>
Alaska	33%	25%	N/A
Arizona	N/A	33%	N/A
Arkansas	28.5%	N/A	N/A
Colorado	33%	N/A	N/A
Connecticut	33%	N/A	N/A
Delaware	33.3%	33.3%	N/A
District of Columbia	33%	N/A	22%
Georgia	0%	0%	25% <sup>N</sup>
Hawai'i	23%	N/A	33%
Idaho	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%
Illinois	33%	0%	0%
Iowa	20%*	0%	0%
Kansas	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	30%	0%	22%
Louisiana	33%	0%	33%

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART C  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level</b>	<b>49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level</b>	<b>49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level</b>
Maine	30%	N/A	N/A
Michigan	N/A	N/A	33%
Missouri	33%	33%	33%
Montana	15%	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	30%	0%	30%
Nevada	25%	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	40%	N/A	33%
New Mexico	33%	0%	33%
New York: 4 <sup>th</sup> Department/ 5 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Districts	14%	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	33.33%	0%	0%
North Dakota	33.33%	0%	81.81%
Ohio	60.71%	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	28.5%	33.3%	0%
Oregon	33.3% <sup>N</sup>	N/A <sup>N</sup>	N/A

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
CHART X – PART C  
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level</b>	<b>49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level</b>	<b>49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level</b>
Pennsylvania	0%	N/A	15%
Tennessee	N/A	N/A	25%
Texas	N/A	N/A	0%
Utah	21.6%	0%	0%
Washington	0%	0%	29%
Wyoming	33%	N/A	N/A

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION  
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 2019 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)  
 CHART X – PART C  
 STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

CHART X – PART C NOTES

*N/A = Data not available or applicable*

**The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alabama, California, Florida, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./9<sup>th</sup> District, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./10<sup>th</sup> District, New York: 2<sup>nd</sup> Dept./2<sup>nd</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> Districts, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin.**

***Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York: 1st Department, New York: 3rd Department, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date.***

Arizona	Q49: Probable Cause committee determines filing of formal charges. 33%= Public Members.
Georgia	Q49c: Review Board.
New Hampshire	Q49a & Q49c: All hearing and board members are volunteers.
Oregon	Q49a: There is a public member on every trial panel, but we only have 1 adjudicator who presides over all trial panels.
Oregon	Q49b: All disciplinary hearings are at the trial level in front of the adjudicator & 2 other panelists.

The American Bar Association Standing Committee on Professional Regulation 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.), educates the public, the profession, the news media, the judiciary, and disciplinary agencies about lawyer disciplinary sanctions, disciplinary agency caseload, staffing, and budgetary activity in each jurisdiction. For decades, the Survey has been used to effect positive changes in caseload management, staffing, and funding for 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 to collect this vital data. Your timely responses are especially appreciated. Prompt responses allow us to publish the data in a manner that is most useful to courts, disciplinary agencies, and the public. If you have any questions regarding your response, please contact Regulation and Global Initiatives Counsel Ellyn Rosen, at [Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org](mailto:Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org).

"Terms and Phrases" are included and referenced at several points in the Survey questionnaire. You may find it convenient to print them prior to starting the Survey.

The Survey is published electronically on the Center for Professional Responsibility's web site at [Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems](#).

***Any suggestions for future modifications that would increase the usefulness of the Survey are welcome and appreciated.***

**PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE VIA EMAIL BY FEBRUARY 21, 2021**

**TO:**

Ellyn Rosen  
[Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org](mailto:Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org)  
American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility  
321 North Clark Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-7598  
P: 312/988-5311

Please provide the following Jurisdiction Contact Information

Jurisdiction:	
Person Reporting:	
Title:	
Telephone:	
E-Mail Address:	

So that the we may maintain accurate information for the ABA [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:	
General Phone:	
Direct Phone:	
Fax:	
E-Mail Address:	
Website (if available):	
Name of Disciplinary Board Chair:	
Title:	
Name of Chief Adjudicative Counsel or other Head of the Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System:	
Title:	
Address:	
Phone:	
Fax:	
E-Mail Address:	

## TERMS & 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 nonlawyer staff, as defined below, who support 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. Examples of titles 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 disciplinary system adjudicators, including Hearing Committees/Panels, Appellate Board members, and Presiding Disciplinary Judges. Their duties include conducting legal research, assisting adjudicators with trial and oral argument preparation, and preparing bench briefs, draft reports and recommendations. The Chief Adjudicative Counsel may also be referred to as the Executive Director, Counsel or General Counsel of the Disciplinary Board.

### **Adjudicative Staff:**

All nonlawyer 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.

### **Alternatives to Discipline Program (also known as Diversion):**

A program allowing for complaints involving lesser misconduct to be handled administratively prior or subsequent to the filing of charges. The respondent and disciplinary counsel enter into an contract tailored to the circumstances of the case whereby the respondent is referred to a remedial program that may include fee arbitration, arbitration, mediation, law office management assistance, a lawyer assistance program, psychological counseling, continuing legal education programs, ethics school or any other program authorized by the court. The respondent's participation is voluntary. Upon the respondent's successful completion of the program, the

contract is terminated and the complaint dismissed. A breach of the contract may result in the resumption of the disciplinary proceedings. An Alternatives to Discipline Program is not a disciplinary sanction, like probation.

**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.

**Charges:**

After a determination has been made that there is probable cause to believe that misconduct occurred, 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 violations of the rules of professional conduct 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, whether or not that complaint is accorded file status or is docketed, without seeking any information in addition to that which is contained in the initial complaint, including but not limited to complaints disposed of for lack of jurisdiction or for not alleging sufficient facts that would, if true, constitute misconduct.

Please fill in the appropriate figures for the calendar/fiscal year 2019. If data is provided for a fiscal year, please identify the time period below. Where a question asks for an average, such as in Part II, please provide that number for the calendar/fiscal year that you use. Some questions will ask for data relating to other years.

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

*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.*

Question	Calendar Year 2019	Fiscal Year
Data provided is based on:		From:
		To:
If your jurisdiction publishes an Annual Report electronically, please provide the link:		

## PART I: CASE PROCESSING & SANCTION STATISTICS

### A. LAWYER POPULATION

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q1.</b>	Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with <u>active</u> licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the calendar/fiscal year:	

## B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q2.</b>	Total number of complaints ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ) received by the disciplinary agency during the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> :	
<b>Q2-a.</b>	Does your jurisdiction have a Central Intake Program ( <i>sometimes referred to as Consumer Assistance Program</i> ):	
<b>Q2-b.</b>	If the total number of complaints received by the agency <u>excludes</u> matters handled by Central Intake or other Consumer Assistance Program, how many matters were handled separately by Central Intake or the Consumer Assistance Program?	
<b>Q3.</b>	Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency <u>prior</u> to calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> that were <u>still pending</u> on the first day of calendar/fiscal year:	
<b>Q4.</b>	Total number of <u>complaints that were screened out/ summarily dismissed without investigation</u> ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ) during the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> . (This number may include complaints that were received prior to the <b>2019</b> calendar/fiscal year, but were not so disposed of until then):	
<b>Q5.</b>	Total number of complaints that were <u>investigated</u> during the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> . (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the <b>2019</b> calendar/fiscal year, as well as complaints received during that year):	
<b>Q6.</b>	Of the total number of complaints reported in response to <b>Question 5</b> , how many were closed or dismissed by the disciplinary agency during calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant charges ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ).	
<b>Q7.</b>	<u>Total number of lawyers</u> against whom charges ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ) were brought in the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> :	

### C. DIVERSION

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q8.</b>	Does your jurisdiction have an Alternatives to Discipline Program/ Diversion Program ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> )?	
<b>Q8-a.</b>	Yes, we have a program but data is not maintained:	
<b>Q9.</b>	Total number of lawyers referred by the disciplinary agency to an Alternatives to Discipline Program/Diversion Program in calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> ?	
Of the <u>total number</u> reported in response to <b>Question 9</b> , what is the number of lawyers who:		
<b>Q9-a.</b>	Successfully completed the program:	
<b>Q9-b.</b>	Did not successfully complete the program:	
<b>Q9-c.</b>	Are still participating in the program:	

### D. SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q10.</b>	What is the total number of lawyers who received <u>private/</u> <u>non-public</u> disciplinary sanctions during the <b>2019</b> calendar/fiscal year:	
Of the total number of lawyers who received private/non-public disciplinary sanctions in response to <b>Question 10</b> , what is the total number of lawyers who received the following:		
<b>Q10-a.</b>	Admonition:	
<b>Q10-b.</b>	Private Reprimand:	
<b>Q10-c.</b>	Letter of Warning/Caution or other ( <i>please specify</i> ):	

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q11.</b>	Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the <b>2019</b> calendar/fiscal year:	
Of the total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in response to <b>Question 11</b> , what is the total number of lawyers who received the following:		
<b>Q11-a.</b>	Involuntary/Adjudicated Disbarment:	
<b>Q11-b.</b>	Disbarment on Consent ( <i>including applicable Resignations as defined in the Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ):	
<b>Q11-c.</b>	Suspension ( <i>excluding interim suspensions</i> ):	
<b>Q11-d.</b>	Interim Suspension ( <i>for risk of harm, criminal conviction, finding of guilt, or other reason</i> ):	
<b>Q11-e.</b>	Admonishment, Reprimand, or Censure:	
<b>Q11-f.</b>	Probation ( <i>including probation imposed in combination with other sanctions, e.g., a suspension for a period of time followed by probation</i> ):	
<b>Q11-g.</b>	Restitution:	
<b>Q11-h.</b>	Payment of Costs:	

## E. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION STATISTICS

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q12.</b>	Total number of lawyers who sought reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law during the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> :	
Total number of lawyers who were reinstated/readmitted in the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> after:		
<b>Q13-a.</b>	Disbarment-Involuntary/Adjudicated or Consensual ( <i>as defined in the Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ):	
<b>Q13-b.</b>	Suspension:	
<b>Q13-c.</b>	Transfer to disability inactive status:	
<b>Q14.</b>	Total number of lawyers whose requests for reinstatement / readmission were denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> :	

## PART II: CASE LOAD STATISTICS

### A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q15.</b>	What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> ? ( <i>Caseload or cases means the number of investigations, charges and reinstatements/readmissions</i> ).	
<b>Q16.</b>	What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> from previous years?	
<b>Q17.</b>	What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> ?	
<b>Q18.</b>	What was the average number per staff lawyer of cases closed/dismissed during calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> ?	

### B. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

*Please indicate estimates by asterisks*

Question		Response 2019
During each of the calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> , What was:		
<b>Q19.</b>	The average number of <b>days</b> to process a complaint from its receipt to screening out/summary dismissal without investigation, ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> )?	
<b>Q20.</b>	The average number of <b>days</b> to process a complaint from its receipt to closure/dismissal <u>after investigation</u> , if no charges are filed?	
<b>Q21.</b>	The average number of <b>days</b> to process a complaint from its receipt to the filing of charges ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> )?	
The average number of <b>days</b> to process a complaint from the <b>filing of charges</b> to the imposition of:		
<b>Q22-a.</b>	Private/Non-Public Sanction:	
<b>Q22-b.</b>	Public Sanction:	
<b>Q23.</b>	The average number of days 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: ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES & FEES / BUDGET

#### A. BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q24.</b>	Total budget for the lawyer discipline system--disciplinary counsel's office and the adjudicative office ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ) -- in calendar/fiscal year <b>2019</b> :	\$
<b>Q25.</b>	Of the amount in response to <b>Question 24</b> , the total budget for disciplinary counsel's office:	\$
<b>Q26.</b>	Of the amount in response to <b>Question 25</b> , the total budget for the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system ( <i>as defined in Terms &amp; Phrases</i> ):	\$
Please indicate the percentage of funding from each source.		
<b>Q27-a.</b>	Bar Association Dues:	%
<b>Q27-b.</b>	Supreme Court Assessed Fees:	%
<b>Q27-c.</b>	Supreme Court General Budget:	%
<b>Q27-d.</b>	Legislative Appropriation:	%
<b>Q27-e.</b>	Other ( <i>please specify</i> ):	%

#### B. ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES AND FEES

*Please respond to the following for the calendar/fiscal year 2019.*

Question		Response 2019
<b>Q28.</b>	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	Annual Fees/Dues

## PART IV: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY AGENCY

Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for calendar/fiscal year **2019** 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

Position		Full-Time 2019	Part-Time 2019
<b>Q29.</b>	Chief Disciplinary Counsel:		
<b>Q30.</b>	Other Disciplinary Counsel:		
<b>Q31.</b>	Other Lawyers on Staff:		
<b>Q32.</b>	Investigators:		
<b>Q33.</b>	Legal Assistants/Paralegals:		
<b>Q34.</b>	Secretarial/Clerical/Administrative Personnel:		
<b>Q35.</b>	Law Students/Clerks:		
<b>Q36.</b>	Auditors:		
<b>Q37.</b>	Probation Monitors:		
<b>Q38.</b>	Other Staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)		
<b>Q39.</b>	<b>TOTAL</b> number of paid disciplinary counsel's office staff: (should be the sum of Q29 through Q 38)		



## B. ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

Position		Full-Time 2019	Part-Time 2019
<b>Q40.</b>	Nonlawyer Head of Office:		
<b>Q41.</b>	Chief Adjudicative Counsel (Head of Office):		
<b>Q42.</b>	Other Adjudicative Counsel:		
<b>Q43.</b>	Other Lawyers on Staff:		
<b>Q44.</b>	Legal Assistants/Paralegals:		
<b>Q45.</b>	Secretarial/Clerical/Administrative Personnel:		
<b>Q46.</b>	Law Students/Clerks:		
<b>Q47.</b>	Other Staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)		
<b>Q48.</b>	<b>TOTAL</b> number of paid staff for Disciplinary Board: (should be the sum of Q40 through Q47)		

Discipline Systems Adjudicators		
<b>Q49.</b>	What is the percentage of nonlawyers serving as adjudicators at the:	
<b>Q49-a.</b>	Hearing Committee/Trial Level:	
<b>Q49-b.</b>	Presiding Disciplinary Judge/Trial Level:	
<b>Q49-c.</b>	Appellate/Board Level:	

Please use the below space for any footnotes to any responses where there is a **major** variation in procedures.
