

2020 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)



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

Justice Daniel J. Crothers
Bismarck, ND

Hon. Dolores Dorsainvil
Upper Marlboro, MD

Shawn M. Harpen
Las Vegas, NV

Paul D. Paton
Edmonton, AB Canada

Carole Buckner
San Diego, CA

Mark W. Gifford
Cheyenne, WY

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

Whitney Dunn, Liaison
Young Lawyers Division
St. Louis, MO

Michael J. Flaherty
Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers
Chicago, IL

Patricia Bartley Schwartz
National Organization of Bar Counsel
Wilmington, DE

Center for Professional Responsibility Staff
Teresa J. Schmid, Director
Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation and
Global Initiatives Counsel



Introduction to the 2020 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 2020 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin did not provide responses by the publication date.

The 2020 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 Elyn S. Rosen, Regulation and Global Initiatives Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility at Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org.



2020 S.O.L.D. Results

The information contained in the 2020 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
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Alabama	18,847	854	No	N/A
Alaska	3,178	149	No	N/A
Arizona	18,970	2,285	Yes	N/A
Arkansas	9,398	559	No	N/A
California	190,521	17,424	No	N/A
Colorado	28,014	3,424	Yes	N/A
Delaware	3,652	129	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	81,335	1,410	No	N/A
Florida ^N	90,024	3,364	Yes	N/A
Georgia	40,478	2,126	Yes	9,458
Hawai'i	4,933	347	No	N/A
Idaho ^N	5,361	341	N/A	N/A
Illinois ^N	73,156	3,936	Yes	N/A
Indiana	18,648	1,142	N/A	N/A
Iowa	9,700	531	No	N/A
Kansas	11,094	908	No	N/A
Kentucky	18,899	895	Yes	N/A
Louisiana	22,680	1,853	Yes	0
Maine	4,828	332	Yes	N/A
Maryland	41,177	1,599	No	N/A
Michigan ^N	42,389	N/A	Yes	N/A
Minnesota	26,169	930	No	N/A

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Montana	4,049	204	No	N/A
Nebraska	6,474	384	No	N/A
Nevada	9,169	1,275	Yes	N/A
New Hampshire	5,500*	169	No	N/A
New Jersey ^N	73,068	0	No	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	19,473	1,492	No	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	24,002	1,144	Yes	N/A
New York 3 rd Department	81,652*	4,197	No	N/A
North Carolina	29,927	927	Yes	8,773
North Dakota	3,080	105	No	N/A
Ohio	44,387	2,013	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	64,578	3,652	Yes	N/A
Rhode Island	5,149	219	No	N/A
Tennessee	23,392	1,134	Yes	2,072

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2. b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Texas ^N	106,591	7,007	Yes	N/A
Utah	9,985	655	Yes	967
Virginia	31,693	3,091	Yes	N/A
Washington	32,949	1,580	Yes	N/A
Wyoming	3,194	114	Yes	N/A
* = Estimated				
TOTAL*	1,341,365	74,974		21,270
AVERAGE*	32,716	1,829		531.75
MEDIAN*	19,473	930		0

CHART I – PART A NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Massachusetts.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Florida	All Survey: The information will be for fiscal years: 07/01/2020 – 06/30/2021 and 07/01/2021-06/30-2022.
Idaho	All Survey: Bar Counsel's Office also serves as general counsel to the Board of Commissioners and the Idaho State Bar; handles ethics questions from the members; administers the Fee Arbitration program and the Client Assistant Fund; and represents the Character and Fitness and Reasonable Accommodations Committee relating to admissions.
Illinois	Q1: Data provided for calendar year 2020 except for lawyer population data (Q1.) which is from 10/31/2019-10/31/2020.
Michigan	Q1: In annual report, substantive data based on calendar year; monetary data based on fiscal year. Q2a & b: This data is maintained by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was not provided. Data for Michigan was provided by the Michigan Attorney Discipline Board.
New Hampshire	Staff lawyers include 3 General Counsel, who perform administrative tasks and supervision, and also screen and investigate complaints; and 2 Disciplinary Counsel, who prosecute formal charges and appear at the NH Supreme Court.
New Jersey	New Jersey's ethics system for the investigation of grievances is designed as a hybrid model, with complex disciplinary cases investigated and presented by full-time staff and disciplinary cases of standard complexity investigated, presented, and also adjudicated by 18 local ethics committees. See New Jersey Court Rule 1:20-1. During the study period (2020, 2021) case intake was decentralized and the data underlying Q2 and Q4 is incomplete.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending From Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Alabama	18	898	202	209	10
Alaska	118	35	56	4	1
Arizona	382	1,813	428	104	67
Arkansas	581	N/A	675	601	24
California	12,350	10,750	10,527	6,095	443
Colorado ^N	424	0 ^N	239	106	58
Delaware	51	92	37	14	11
District of Columbia	330	1,156	584	324	26
Florida	2,614	3,119	5,978	2,784	105
Georgia	474	260*	2,600	1,801	80
Hawai'i	407	81	301	100	17
Idaho	303	0	644	359	19
Illinois	2,034	1,222	4,284	2,936	3,027

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART B
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Indiana	35	1,040	97	97	27
Iowa	199	318	412	238	14
Kansas	N/A	460	193	105	36
Kentucky	211	617	278	163	65
Louisiana	1,371	1,101	2,101	636	124
Maine	97	36	495	212	139
Maryland	N/A	80*	2,000*	1,715*	70
Michigan ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	482	436	975	217	34
Missouri	437	811	1,292	363	14
Montana	133	32	337	176	7
Nebraska	110	200	494	0	4
Nevada	204	1,012	263	94	65
New Hampshire	45	68	146	85	11
New Jersey ^N	1,110	N/A	1,732	646	201

* = Estimated

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	1,313	1,476	1,778	98	33
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	558	686	1,609	346	103
New York: 3 rd Department	1,044	2,408	2,833	256	15
North Carolina ^N	678	292*	496	396	29
North Dakota	39	59	70	47	2
Ohio	724	1,173	1,795	820	72
Pennsylvania	222	692	3,182	2,478	148
Rhode Island	N/A	49	170	169	1
Tennessee	394	475	1,053	453	81
Texas ^N	N/A	4,870	1,946	1,394	N/A

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART B
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Utah	624	302	977	794	26
Virginia	324	2,440	651	473	N/A
Washington	565	753	1,037	554	45
Wisconsin	465	1,070	344	57	22
Wyoming	76	25	128	97	2
* = Estimated					
TOTAL*	31,011	41,023	54,188	28,271	5,255
AVERAGE*	775	1,001	1,290	673	128
MEDIAN*	356	460	540	228	27

CHART I – PART B 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: Massachusetts.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Colorado	Q4: Based on our interpretations of the definitions, zero requests for investigation is summarily dismissed under the Colorado model. However, 2,767 matters were dismissed after an initial review by an Intake Attorney in 2020. Colorado's Attorney Regulation system has included a central intake section since 1998. The central intake model is designed to facilitate contact between our office and anyone who has a complaint or concern about a lawyer's conduct. To that end, each request for investigation is assigned to one of six attorneys for review and follow up with the complaining witness. The attorney will, in most instances, discuss the concerns summarized in the initial request for investigation and draw out any additional information necessary to fully understand the concerns and analyze the lawyer's conduct. The central intake model is designed to ensure that each request for investigation is properly investigated and analyzed regardless of the information received in an initial request for investigation. These intake lawyers often ask for and receive more information from the respondent attorney, and often interview the respondent and other witnesses in the intake review.
Michigan	Q3-7: This data is maintained by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was not provided. Data for Michigan was provided by the Michigan Attorney Discipline Board.
New Jersey	Q7: During 2020, 238 charges were filed against 201 unique attorneys. Those charges were presented to the Disciplinary Review Board and New Jersey Supreme Court in one of six forms: Disbarment by Consent, Discipline by Consent, Presentment after Hearing, Motion for Final Discipline, Motion for Reciprocal Discipline, or Stipulation. New Jersey understands Q7 to require the latter number and is providing both out of an abundance of caution.
North Carolina	Q4: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

P

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline/ Diversion Program	8a. Yes, there is a Program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
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	110	55	0	55
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
California	Yes	N/A	17	8	9	0
Colorado ^N	Yes	N/A	57*	47	3	1
Delaware	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida	Yes	N/A	134	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	Yes	N/A	1	1	0	0
Idaho	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Illinois ^N	Yes	N/A	23	18	3 ^N	2

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II- DIVERSION**

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. There is a Program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
Indiana ^N	Yes ^N	Yes	16	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	Yes	N/A	8	0	0	8
Kansas ^N	Yes	N/A	19 ^N	19	0	16
Kentucky	Yes	N/A	56	44	10	2
Louisiana	Yes	N/A	9	5	1	3
Maine	Yes	N/A	1	5	0	1
Maryland ^N	Yes	N/A	17	9	1	24
Michigan ^N	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Missouri	Yes	N/A	12	9	1	2
Montana	Yes	N/A	3	1	0	2
Nebraska	Yes	N/A	2	2	N/A	0
Nevada	Yes	N/A	10	9	N/A	1

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II- DIVERSION**

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. There is a Program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
New Hampshire	Yes	N/A	5	5	0	0
New Jersey	Yes	N/A	53	38	0	53
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	Yes	N/A	0	0	0	0
New York: 3 rd Department	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina ^N	Yes ^N	N/A	13	7	0	27
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	Yes	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

*** = Estimated**



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II- DIVERSION

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. There is a Program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
Tennessee	Yes	N/A	33	33	N/A	N/A
Texas ^N	Yes	N/A	80	80	N/A	N/A
Utah	Yes	0	6	6	0	0
Washington	Yes	N/A	18	4	0	14
Wyoming	Yes	N/A	2	2	0	0

* = Estimated

CHART II – NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Massachusetts, Ohio, and Virginia.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Colorado	Q9: Intake: 26, Investigative: 31, Trial: 0.
Illinois	Q9b: One lawyer died during the supervision period.
Indiana	Q8: JLAP & Trust Account School.
Kansas	Q9: 19 referred for diversion, 29 diversions implemented.
Maryland	Q9a: Includes prior FY.
Michigan	Q9, 9a, b, c: This data is maintained by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was not provided. Data for Michigan was provided by the Michigan Attorney Discipline Board.
North Carolina	Q8: Successful completion of the diversion program may, but does NOT necessarily, result in dismissal of the grievance.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III- PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
Alabama	16	N/A	16	11
Alaska	2	1	1	N/A
Arizona ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas ^N	2	N/A	N/A	2
California	552	2	13	537
Colorado	15	15	0	137
Delaware	3	3	0	6
District of Columbia ^N	4	N/A	N/A	4 ^N
Florida	N/A	32	N/A	N/A
Georgia	19	14	5	40
Hawai'i	11	11	1	16
Idaho	15	1	14	N/A
Illinois ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indiana	16	1	1	14
Iowa	83	83	N/A	16
Kansas	0	14	0	38
Kentucky	58	36	5	20
Louisiana	27	26	0	0

* = Estimated



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III- PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
Maine	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maryland ^N	N/A ^N	N/A	N/A	45 ^N
Michigan ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	97	82	0	15
Missouri ^N	N/A	76*	N/A	103
Montana	0	0	0	11
Nebraska	4	0	4	0
Nevada	59	N/A	N/A	59
New Hampshire	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Jersey ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	128	38	0	90
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	111	24	0	87

* = Estimated



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III- PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
New York: 3 rd Department	81	33	8	40
North Carolina	90	38	0	52
North Dakota	9	9	N/A	9
Ohio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	42	35	7	200
Rhode Island	16	3	2	11
Tennessee	71	17	21	0
Texas ^N	100	N/A	100	N/A
Utah ^N	8	8	N/A	N/A ^N
Virginia	50	27	23	4
Washington	4	N/A	N/A	4
Wyoming	4	N/A	4	N/A
* = Estimated				
TOTAL*	1,697	553	225	1,468
AVERAGE*	44	15	6	39
MEDIAN*	15	3	0	10



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III- PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

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, Illinois, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Ohio.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Arkansas	Q10c: 2 Non-public warnings.
District of Columbia	Q10c: 4 Diversions.
Maryland	Q10: A warning in Maryland is not a sanction.
Maryland	Q10c: Not considered a sanction.
Michigan	The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2020 Questionnaire.
Minnesota	Q10c: Private probation.
Missouri	Q10: Admonitions and Guidance Letters are not private.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.
Utah	10c: Letters of warning/caution are not considered discipline in this jurisdiction.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Alabama	45	6	5	25	3	5	1	N/A	62
Alaska	2	1	N/A	1	1	1	0	0	0
Arizona	94	3	5	36	0	24	39	4	94
Arkansas ^N	18	1	5	4	0	9	0	N/A ^N	N/A ^N
California	304	96	30	83	14	50	114	44	233
Colorado	52	3	5	35	6	24	20	3	52
Delaware	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	53	23	3	21	26	7	2	1	0
Florida	235	38	20	114	0	63	9	21	248
Georgia	48	18	N/A	15	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	10	1	6	3	0	0	0	2	1

*** = Estimated**

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
Idaho	7	0	1	2	1	15	1	0	0
Illinois	81	15	8	35	5	8	16	4	81
Indiana	37	3	0	18	2	1	9	N/A	11
Iowa	36	2	0	15	2	17	N/A	N/A	17
Kansas	25	2	1	5	1	15	1	N/A	11
Kentucky	13	2	0	7	1	3	2	2	10
Louisiana	132	13	9	48	17	8	36	0	132
Maine	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	1,287	N/A
Maryland	76	11	17	16	0	32	N/A	N/A	19
Michigan ^N	79	9 ^N	9	39	7	22 ^N	5	19	79
Minnesota ^N	33	1	2	24	0	1	5 ^N	0	33 ^N

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Missouri ^N	28	8	1	11	3	4	2	N/A	N/A ^N
Montana	7	1	1	3	0	5	2	2	7
Nebraska	11	7	0	2	3	2	0	0	8
Nevada	0	3	1	28	1	22	14	7	54
New Hampshire	9	1	0	5	0	3	4	N/A	9
New Jersey	167	10	10	42	18	87	0	2	156
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	35	15	4	10	4	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	81	19	1	54	3	4	N/A	0	0

*** = Estimated**

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
New York: 3 rd Department	70	17	0	43	2	8	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	54	0	13	7	2	63	9	0	54
North Dakota ^N	1	1	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	69	1	14	32	14	5	N/A	0	0
Pennsylvania	106	5	25	47	15	46	4	N/A	220
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	42	0	11	19	5	7	0	14	35
Texas ^N	192	18	15	123	N/A	36	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	18	3	1	8	0	5	1	0	0

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Virginia	67	11	16	20	N/A	20	N/A	N/A	\$121,331.77
Washington	47	5	10	14	4	18	9	9	35
Wyoming	7	1	0	3	0	3	0	0	7
* = Estimated									
TOTAL*	2,392	366	249	1,034	159	644	303	1,421	123,000
AVERAGE*	58	9	6	25	4	16	8	37	3,154
MEDIAN*	42	3	3	18	2	7	1	0	11

CHART III – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Arkansas	Q11g: Provided dollar amount collected from sanctioned lawyers, rather than number sanctioned: \$11,000.
Arkansas	Q11h: Provided dollar amount collected from sanctioned lawyers, rather than number sanctioned: \$1,450.
Michigan	Q11a: Adjudicated.
Michigan	Q11e: Reprimands
Minnesota	Q11f: Suspensions with probation are counted separately. Most 30/60/90 day suspensions without reinstatement hearings include probation.
Minnesota	Q11h: Payment of costs: \$900.
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 Missouri Supreme Court Rule 5.19 (h).
North Dakota	Q11h: Not captured.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
Alabama	5	6	25	7	4
Alaska	3	3	3	1	0
Arizona	30	0	18	0	8
Arkansas	1	0	1	0	0
California	20	1	5	0	1
Colorado	1	0	1	0	0
Delaware	2	0	1	0	0
District of Columbia	7	1	1	0	5
Florida	14	2	10	0	9
Georgia	16	1	2	N/A	0
Hawai'i	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	3	0	0
Illinois	3	1	1	0	1
Indiana	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	2	0	2	0	0
Kansas	3	3	3	1	0
Kentucky	11	0	9	0	0

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
Louisiana	8	0	26	3	0
Maine ^N	4	1	1	0	2
Maryland	10	1	2	0	7
Michigan ^N	4	0	3	0	2
Minnesota	15	1	9	0	0
Missouri ^N	135 ^N	0	96 ^N	N/A	17
Montana	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	3	0	0	1	1
Nevada	10	0	2	1	1
New Hampshire	1	0	1	0	0
New Jersey	18	N/A	18	0	0
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	13	0	3	0	10
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	11	0	6	0	6

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IV- REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
New York: 3 rd Department	59	0	2	0	4
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	12	0	8	N/A	3
Pennsylvania	119	6	6	0	3
Rhode Island	40	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	10	0	10	0	0
Texas ^N	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Utah	4	0	3	0	0
Virginia	1	1	N/A	0	0
Washington	19	0	11	1	1
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0
* = Estimated					
TOTAL*	487	25	194	15	69
AVERAGE*	12	1	5	0	2
MEDIAN*	5	0	2	0	0

CHART IV NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Maine	Q12: All administratively reinstated.
Michigan	Q12, Q13b: Michigan interprets "sought reinstatement/readmission" to mean lawyers who filed a petition for reinstatement for adjudication by a hearing panel. In Michigan, any suspensions 180 days or longer, including disbarment, require the filing of a petition, an investigation by the AGC, and adjudication by a hearing panel. See MCR 9.123(B)-(D); 9.124(B)(1)-(5). Suspensions for 30-179 days only require the filing of an affidavit attesting that the lawyer has fully complied with his/her suspension order. The Grievance Administrator has 7 days to file an objection. If no objection is filed, our Board must "promptly issue an order of reinstatement." See MCR 9.123(A). We did not include the number of lawyers who were reinstated in 2020, via affidavit filed pursuant to MCR 9.123(A).
Missouri	Q12: Some of the reinstatements counted were 'Return to Active Status' Reinstatements. Those individuals apply for reinstatement under Missouri Supreme Court Rule 6.06, but have not been suspended or disbarred. In 2020, 75 of the 95 applicants returned to active status. 9 applications were dismissed and 11 were still pending at the end of 2020.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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	
Alabama	427		N/A		427		N/A	
Arizona ^N	372	100	18	39	354	61	302	42
Arkansas	256		182		140		168	
California	228		112		116		136	
Colorado ^N	571	30	N/A		571	30	529	13
Delaware	40		17		23		23	
District of Columbia	36.5		19.4		1.1		20.25	
Florida	135.86		59.40		76.45		70.88	
Hawai'i	124		59		41		42	
Idaho	248		109		139		93	
Illinois	195		195		640		640	
Iowa	90*		90*		75*		80*	
Kentucky	129		45		84		112	
Louisiana	175		114		60		53	

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Maine ^N	N/A ^N	40	N/A ^N	N/A
Maryland ^N	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	36 ^N	N/A ^N
Michigan ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	28	27	32	28
Montana	313	109	204	125
Nebraska	96	27	103	93
Nevada ^N	18	14	50	N/A ^N
New Jersey ^N	66	42	43	40
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	160	55	221	118
New York: 3 rd Department	404	149	594	391
North Carolina	92	45	62	45
Ohio	39	31	68	63

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Pennsylvania	138	27	46	108
Rhode Island	85	N/A	85	85
Tennessee	111	110	169	142
Utah	215	105	111	90
Virginia	97.6	32.5	65.1	47.3
Washington	69	36	25	53
Wyoming	67	10	57	56
* = Estimated				
AVERAGE*	152	56	141	112
MEDIAN*	104	41	72	67

CHART V NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York: 2nd Department/ 2nd, 11th, & 13th Judicial Districts, North Dakota, and Texas.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Arizona	Q15: Intake Caseload 372, Litigation Caseload 100 = total 472.
Arizona	Q16: Intake Caseload 18, Litigation Caseload 39 = total 57.
Arizona	Q17: Intake Caseload 354, Litigation Caseload 61 = total 415.
Arizona	Q18: Intake Caseload 302, Litigation Caseload 42 = total 344.
Colorado	Q15 & 17: Intake Caseload 571, Trial Caseload 30 = total 601.
Colorado	Q18: Intake Caseload 529, Trial Caseload 13 = total 542.
Maine	Q15 & 17: Shared caseload.
Maryland	Q15,16 & 18: Statistics not maintained.
Maryland	Q17: Docketed cases.
Michigan	The Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2020 Questionnaire.
Nevada	Q18: Not tracked
New Jersey	Q15: Includes Investigation, Hearing, DRB and Supreme Court stages.
New Jersey	Q16: Includes Investigation, Hearing and DRB stages.
New Jersey	Q17-18: Includes Investigation and Hearing stages.



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Alabama	N/A	150 days	180 days	240 days	300 days	80 days
Alaska	129 days	319 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona ^N	19 days	222 days	321 days	N/A	122 days ^N	72 days
California	37 days	256 days	495 days	771 days	741 days	195 days
Colorado	40 days	213 days	324 days	N/A	177 days	109 days
Georgia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	64 days	435 days	725 days	1 day	5 days	N/A
Idaho ^N	N/A ^N	183 days	243 days	N/A	122 days	61 days
Illinois ^N	fewer than 10 days	fewer than 90 days	558 days	N/A	401 days	1,041 days ^N
Iowa	2-3 days	100* days	180* days	N/A	365* days	90* days
Kansas ^N	14 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Kentucky	2 days	174 days	213 days	341 days	376 days	124 days
Louisiana	38 days	312 days	351 days	87 days	415 days	468 days
Maine	45 days	163 days	N/A	0 days	261 days	120 days
Maryland	7-10* days	120-210* days	365* days	N/A	547* days	60* days
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	289 days	267 days
Minnesota	21 days	279 days	598 days	N/A	208 days	248 days
Montana	30 days	180 days	180 days	N/A	180 days	60 days
Nebraska	8 days	129 days	431 days	200 days	365 days	547-730 days
Nevada	30 days	150 days	150 days	30 days	<120 days	<120 days
New Hampshire	5 days	53 days	346 days	N/A	365 days	64 days
New Jersey ^N	N/A ^N	208 days	339 days	N/A	614 days	44 days ^N

*** = Estimated**



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
New York: 2 nd Department/10 th District	7-14 days	365 days	365 days	N/A	180-270 days	180-270 days
New York: 3 rd Department	60 days	365 days	365 days	N/A	180-270 days	180-270 days
North Carolina ^N	152* days	299 days	407 days	N/A	267 days	0 days
North Dakota ^N	N/A	80 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	381 days
Ohio	74 days	188 days	342 days	N/A	292 days	576 days
Pennsylvania	330 days	420 days	N/A	270 days	420 days	120 days
Rhode Island	2 days	90 days	180 days	90 days	270 days	N/A
Tennessee	1-2 days	148 days	191 days	N/A	460 days	24 days
Texas ^N	16 days	N/A	N/A	141 days	141 days	N/A

*** = Estimated**



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	14*	101*	328*	N/A	329*	N/A
Wyoming	37	75	200	N/A	360	N/A

*** = Estimated**

CHART VI- NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Missouri, New York: 2nd Department/2nd, 11th, & 13th Judicial Districts, and Utah.

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Arizona	Q22a: Arizona does not have private/non-public sanctions.
Georgia	Q19-23: Georgia did not supply a response for this portion.
Idaho	Q19: Idaho investigates all complaints.
Kansas	Q20-23: Kansas does not track this data.
Michigan	Q19-21: Information not available because the Attorney Grievance Commission maintains this data and did not respond to the 2020 Questionnaire.
New Jersey	Q19: New Jersey's ethics system for the investigation of grievances is designed as a hybrid model, with complex disciplinary cases investigated and presented by full-time staff and disciplinary cases of standard complexity investigated, presented, and also adjudicated by 18 local ethics committees. See New Jersey Court Rule 1:20-1. During the study period (2020, 2021) case intake was decentralized and the data underlying Q2 and Q4 is incomplete.
North Carolina	Q19: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
North Dakota	Q19, 21, 22a & 22b: North Dakota does not track this data.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active Licenses	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Alabama	18,847	\$2,242,430	\$2,242,430	N/A	85% Bar Association Dues 15% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Alaska	3,178	\$890,791	N/A	N/A	33% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Arizona	18,970	\$4,247,592	\$3,635,617	\$611,975	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Arkansas	9,398	\$986,370.09	\$965,260.00	\$21,110.09	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
California	190,521	\$77,000,000	\$63,300,000	\$13,700,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Colorado	28,014	\$8,014,113	\$7,011,846	\$1,002,267	100% Registration Fines & Attorney Fines	N/A
Delaware ^N	3,652	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	81,335	\$9,890,290	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Florida	90,024	\$15,509,786	\$15,509,786	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A

***=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Georgia	40,478	\$3,921,000	\$3,871,000	\$50,000	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Hawai'i	4,933	\$2,034,905	\$2,034,905	\$2,034,905	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Idaho	5,361	\$863,262	\$797,086	\$66,176	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Illinois	73,156	\$18,008,402	\$15,849,722	\$2,158,680	92. 5% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	7.5% Investment Income & Expense Reimbursements
Indiana	18,648	\$2,809,043	\$2,809,043	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Iowa	9,700	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$200,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Kansas	11,094	\$2,245,000	Budget not maintained separately	Budget not maintained separately	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A

***=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Kentucky	18,899	\$1,392,643	\$1,392,643	\$1,392,643	100% Bar Association Fees	N/A
Louisiana ^N	22,680	\$5,937,779 ^N	\$3,286,777	\$2,651,002	89% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	11% Online CLE courses; Pro Hac Vice; Cost Recovery
Maine	4,828	\$1,304,503	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Maryland	41,177	\$4,672,282	\$4,672,282	N/A	96% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	4% Bank Interest, Recovered Costs
Michigan	42,502	\$5,496,627 ^N	\$4,333,283 ^N	\$1,163,344 ^N	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Minnesota	26,169	\$4,534,671	\$4,534,671	N/A	96% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	4% Judgments, Reinstatements, Revenue Recapture, Professional Firms

***=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Missouri	31,063	\$3,532,439	\$2,944,189	\$588,250	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Montana	4,049	\$829,773	\$829,773	N/A	100% Bar Association Fees	N/A
Nebraska	6,474	\$586,084	\$586,084	\$0	99% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0.5% Supreme Court General Budget, 0.5% Other
Nevada	9,169	\$1,845,087	\$1,845,087	N/A	53% Bar Association Dues	1% Supreme Court Assessed Fees, 46% Other Bar Income
New Hampshire	\$5,500	\$1,200,000*	N/A	N/A	95% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	5% Payment of Costs
New Jersey	73,068	\$13,015,754	\$10,589,266	\$2,426,488	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department/ 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	19,473	\$1,800,000	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	N/A

***=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
New York: 2 nd Department/ 10 th District	23,604	\$2,484,036	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	29,927	\$4,525,110.11	\$4,428,156.00	\$96,954.11	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
North Dakota	3,080	\$625,481	\$625,481	N/A	38.5% Bar Association Dues 61.5% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Ohio	44,387	\$4,041,577	\$3,390,875	\$650,702	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Pennsylvania	64,578	\$11,501,776	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A
Rhode Island	5,149	\$1,010,479.85	\$1,010,479.85	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	N/A

***=Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII- BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Tennessee	23,392	\$4,075,776	\$4,075,776	N/A	N/A	N/A
Texas ^N	106,591	\$9,298,656	\$9,297,115	\$1,541	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Utah ^N	9,985	\$1,468,853	\$1,468,853	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Virginia	31,693	\$6,452,510	\$5,441,355	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Washington ^N	32,949	\$6,325,726	\$5,874,216	\$451,510	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
Wyoming	3,194	\$438,900	\$420,851	\$18,049	100% Bar Association Dues	N/A
*=-Estimated						

CHART VII -NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Delaware, and New York: 3rd Department.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Louisiana	Q24: Fiscal year 2019-2020.
Michigan	Q24, 25, & 26: Actual.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.
Utah	Q24 & 25: Although the OPC now reports by calendar year, its fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30 of the following year. As such, the 2020 responses are for the time period of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020.
Washington	Q27: Not earmarked. Less than two percent 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.

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
Alabama	\$350								Special: \$187.50
Alaska	\$660								70+ years old and 25+years of practice = \$335 grandfathered in pre 2021
Arizona		\$345	\$345	\$345	\$505	\$505	\$505		
Arkansas		\$125	\$125	\$125	\$200	\$200	\$200		Age 65+ and retired= \$20
California	\$497								
Colorado		\$190	\$190	\$190	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$130 under 65 years	65 years+/ inactive= \$0
Delaware		\$174	\$174	\$174	\$174	\$174	\$227		More than 10 Years = \$353
District of Columbia	\$320							\$199	
Florida	\$265								
Georgia	\$254								

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
Hawai'i		\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$250		
Idaho		\$320	\$320	\$320	\$320	\$425	\$425	\$150	72+ years = \$70
Illinois		\$0	\$121	\$121	\$385	\$385	\$385		
Indiana	\$180								
Iowa	\$270								
Kansas	\$175								
Kentucky			\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$310		Members of Judiciary= \$150
Louisiana		\$170	\$170	\$170	\$235	\$235	\$235		50+ years in practice- \$0
Maine		\$160	\$160	\$160	\$265	\$265	\$265		New Attorneys never admitted anywhere= \$160 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		

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
Missouri		\$280	\$280	\$280	\$410	\$410	\$410		Non-Resident = \$325
Montana	\$510								
Nebraska	\$98								
Nevada	\$450								
New Hampshire			\$485			\$535			Full-Time Judicial= \$295/ Active = \$565
New Jersey		\$35	\$35	\$35	\$183	\$212	\$212		
New York: 2 nd Department/ 2 nd 11 th , & 13 th Districts	\$375								Biennially
New York: 2 nd Department/ 10 th District	\$375								
New York 3 rd Department	\$375								
North Carolina	\$325								

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
North Dakota		\$325	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$380		After 9/1 of current year =\$200
Ohio	\$175								
Pennsylvania	\$225								
Rhode Island	\$200								
Tennessee	\$170								
Texas ^N		\$68	\$68	\$68	\$148	\$148	\$235		Over 70 Years = \$0
Utah		\$250	\$250	\$250	\$425	\$425	\$425		
Virginia	\$285								
Washington		\$229	\$229	\$458	\$458	\$458	\$458		
Wyoming		\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$355.00		

CHART VIII -NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Texas

All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2021 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	N/A	2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5	N/A	1.5	N/A	1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	1.0	N/A	15.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	4.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	9.0	N/A	0.0	N/A
Arkansas	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California	1.0	N/A	5.0	N/A	81.25	N/A	71.42	N/A	29.5	N/A	53.25	N/A	N/A	N/A
Colorado ^N	1.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	5.0	N/A	7.0	N/A	8.0	N/A	1.0	N/A
Delaware	1.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	43.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	11.0	1.0	54.0	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
Hawai'i	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois ^N	1.0	0.0	27.0 ^N	2.1	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.8	8.0	1.4	9.0	1.0	0.0	1.5
Indiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Iowa	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.6	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	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	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Maine ^N	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	N/A	N/A
Maryland	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	1.0	0.0

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2021 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
Massachusetts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	1.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	10.69	0.0	.62	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	0.0	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	0.0	0.0
Nevada	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire ^N	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	20.0	N/A	1.0	0.0	23.0	0.0	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th 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 nd Department/10 th District	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 3 rd Department	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	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	8.0	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

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2021 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
Ohio	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	29.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	15.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas ^N	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
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	0.30
Wyoming	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2021 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX- PART A
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

CHART IX NOTES: PART A

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Colorado	Q34: I.C.: 1; Intake Investigator: 2; Building Management: 1; Office Manager: 1; Executive Assistant: 1; Payroll: 1; Reception: 1
Illinois	Q30: Three counsel are Deputy Administrators who function as managers as well as line prosecutors.
Maine	Q31: Special Counsel & Board Clerk 32/hrs.
Maine	Q34: 2 Assistants to Bar Counsel & 1 office Assistant.
Michigan	This data is maintained by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was not provided.
New Hampshire	Q29-31: Staff lawyers include 3 General Counsel, who perform administrative tasks and supervision, and also screen and investigate complaints; and 2 Disciplinary Counsel, who prosecute formal charges and appear at the NH Supreme Court.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.
Texas	Q30: Regional Counsel.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.0	N/A	N/A	8.0	0.0
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Arizona	2.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	Records Department	36.0	N/A
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	2.0	0.0	N/A	243.42	0.0
Colorado	0.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	3.0	N/A	I.T. (3)	45.0	N/A
Delaware	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0	N/A
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	1.0	0.0	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	11.0	1.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	1.0
Illinois	3.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	15.0	1.1	(HR Director, Registration Staff, I.T., Receptionists, Docketing)	70.0	8.4
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	18.0	2.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	10.0	0.60
Kansas	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	I.T.	11.0	4.0
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	16.0	0.0
Louisiana	2.0	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
2020 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	2020 CLE Administrator; 2021 Board Clerk	11.0	1.0
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Executive Director & Administrative Assistant	26.0	0.0
Massachusetts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.42	0.0	Judges (full-time) .17 Accounting (full-time) .25	32.73	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		5.0	0.0
Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0		5.0	0.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Legal Administrator (also handles probation monitoring)	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 Jersey	7.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0	0.0	I.T.	68.0	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th , & 13 th Districts	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	0.0

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
 2020 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
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	20.0	0.0
New York: 3 rd Department	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	14.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	Attorney/Client Program	49.0	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	28.0	1.0
Pennsylvania	7.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	55.0	3.0
Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.8	0.0
Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	I.T.	32.0	0.0
Texas ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	93.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	0.0
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	0.30
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A		
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	1.0

CHART IX NOTES - PART B

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Michigan	This data is maintained by the Attorney Grievance Commission and was not provided.
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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	0.083	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	1.0	0.0	19.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	N/A	1.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	1.0	1.0	0.0	N/A
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 ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.25 ^N	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	3.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.23*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.65*	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	9.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Maine	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan	N/A	N/A	1.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	0.0	N/A	2.0	N/A	2.0	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
New Jersey	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	N/A	N/A

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 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
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	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	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	7.0	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

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York: 2nd Department/10th District, New York: 2nd Department/2nd, 11th, & 13th Districts, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th & 8th Districts, New York: 3rd Department, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Texas.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

Georgia

Q45: Clerk of Board

Jurisdiction	47. Other Staff		47. Other Staff Details	48. TOTAL Paid Staff	
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
California	0.0	0.0	N/A	27.383	0.0
Colorado	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.00	1.0
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	Counsel to review board	0.0	0.5
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	3.0	0.0	Deputy Clerk	9.0	1.4
Iowa	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.88*
Kansas	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
Louisiana	5.0	0.0	5 Tech Full-Time	20.0	1.0
Maine	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0	0.0
Michigan	0	N/A	N/A	7.0	N/A
Missouri	0.0	0.00	0.50 (Part-Time) I.T.	4.0	0.0

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	I.T.	18.0	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	3.0	1.0
Pennsylvania	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Virginia	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	0.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	.4
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0

CHART X – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York: 2nd Department/9th District, New York: 2nd Department/10th District, New York: 2nd Department/2nd, 11th, & 13th Districts, New York: 3rd Department, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin had not provided data by the publication date.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART C
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

Jurisdiction	49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level	49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level	49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level
Alaska	33%	25%	N/A
Arizona ^N	N/A	33%	N/A
Arkansas	28.6%	N/A	N/A
California	5%	1%	2%
Colorado	33%	N/A	33%
Delaware	33%	33%	N/A
District of Columbia	33%	N/A	22%
Georgia ^N	0%	0%	25% ^N
Hawai'i	20%	0%	33%
Idaho	33%	33%	33%
Illinois	33%	0%	0%
Iowa	20%	N/A	N/A
Kansas	0%	0%	0%



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART C
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

Jurisdiction	49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level	49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level	49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level
Kentucky	30%	0%	22%
Louisiana	33%	N/A	33%
Maine	30%	0%	0%
Michigan ^N	N/A	N/A	33%
Minnesota	15%	N/A	N/A
Missouri	33%	33%	N/A
Nebraska	30%	0%	30%
Nevada	32%	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire ^N	40% ^N	N/A	33% ^N
New Jersey ^N	33.3% ^N	0	33.3% ^N
North Carolina	33.3%	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	33.3%	0%	27.28%
Ohio	86%	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	0%	0%	15%



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2020 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART C
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

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

CHART X – PART C NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data. The following jurisdictions did not maintain data: Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York: 2nd Department/9th District, New York: 2nd Department/10th District, New York: 2nd Department/2nd, 11th, & 13th Districts, New York: 3rd Department, Rhode Island, Virginia.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York: 1st Department, New York: 2nd Department 9th District, New York: 4th Department/5th, 7th, & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin 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.
Michigan	Q49c: 3 non-lawyer members/ 6 lawyer members
New Hampshire	Q49a & c: All hearing and board members are volunteers.
New Jersey	Q49a: Hearing panels in NJ are comprised of one public member (nonlawyer) and two lawyers. R. 1:20-6(a)(1). Where a hearing is expected to exceed two days in length, must be heard on consecutive days, or in the interest of justice, the Director may request that the New Jersey Supreme Court appoint a compensated Special Ethics Master. R. 1:20-6(b).
New Jersey	Q49c: The Disciplinary Review Board (DRB) is New Jersey's intermediate appellate tribunal for attorney disciplinary cases. The DRB is comprised of three public members (nonlawyer) and six attorney members. R. 1:20-15(a).
Texas	All answers are for 6/1/2020-5/31/2021.