

Report of the Work of
The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
First Floor, Two Lemoyne Drive, Lemoyne, PA 17043
For the Year 2004

General Statistics

The attorney population in Pennsylvania has increased dramatically since the Board began its operations. The number of active paid attorneys for the 1972-1973 Fiscal Year was **13,057** as compared to **55,325** active paid attorneys as of December 31, 2004.

The Board is considering more serious and complicated matters. The efficient disposition of complaints is a matter that the Board is continually required to keep under review. During the year 2004, 4,891 new complaints were received by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, down from the 5,013 complaints filed in 2003. 4,887 complaints were disposed of during the year, 326 of which resulted in discipline. At the start of 2005, 1,007 active complaints were pending. A tabulation of the disciplinary actions taken since the beginning of the Board's operations in 1972 is set forth on the attached chart. In 2004, the Supreme Court ordered the disbarment of 37 attorneys and suspended 53 attorneys (15 of which were temporary suspensions).

Budget

As in previous years, the financial records of the Board have been subjected to unannounced examination by our outside auditors. The results of these audits have all been satisfactory. Further, Board Members are furnished with detailed monthly financial reports by the Office of the Secretary. This enables the Board to monitor each budget line item on an ongoing basis.

For Fiscal Year 2003-2004, the Board's revenues totaled \$7,521,670.00 and expenditures totaled \$7,764,367.00. Expenses exceeded revenues by \$242,697.00. Several unanticipated factors caused this shortfall. Salaries, employee benefits and office rent comprise 80% of the Board's expenses. The Board budgeted an 18% increase in medical insurance costs, and the actual increase was 23%. The average monthly costs for transcripts were normally \$8,000.00, but the cost for the month of June, alone, was \$22,428.00. Consulting fees increased due to the retention of Hershey Philbin Associates, as more fully explained in the Communications Committee section of this report. Due to the Board's unexpected migration onto the Supreme Court's new Microsoft Exchange email server, computer hardware and software exceeded budget. Finally, conservatorships were budgeted at \$100,000.00, but the actual amount spent through June 30, 2004 totaled \$175,748.00. This expense was largely impacted by invoices totaling over \$105,000.00 submitted by the Allegheny County Bar Association in two cases. Had the Board not been reimbursed \$35,500.00 from two estates, this line item would have been more than double the amount budgeted.

After factoring in the Unrealized Gain on Investments of \$656,400.00, revenues exceeded expenditures by \$413,703.00. This was the first investment gain in several years. The Board's invested funds experienced unrealized losses of \$66,583.00 in Fiscal Year 2002-2003 and \$501,243.00 in Fiscal Year 2001-2002.

Increase in Annual Fee

The annual fees represent 92% of Disciplinary Board revenues. With the increase of the attorney annual assessment in 1991 from \$75.00 to \$105.00 and the Board's efforts to establish funds for computerization, leasehold improvements and education, in addition to conservative budgeting and prudent investments, the Board was able to continue its operations for ten (10) years without any additional increase.

In April 2001, the Disciplinary Board recommended to the Supreme Court that the annual assessment be increased to \$155.00 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2001. After due consideration, by Order dated May 15, 2001, the Supreme Court directed that the annual assessment be increased to \$130.00. In the fall of 2001, the Board requested that our auditors prepare a three year forecast based on the increased fee of \$130.00. The 2002 forecast projected that income would exceed expenses until at least Fiscal Year 2004-2005. As outlined on the enclosed chart, since 1995 the average increase in the number of newly registered attorneys has slowed down considerably from the increases that we had experienced in the early 1990's.

The annual Lawyer Assessment Committee telephone conference call occurred in December, 2004. At that time, the Board submitted a tentative budget for Fiscal Year 2005-2006, which projected that expenses would exceed revenues by approximately \$870,000.00. The Board suggested a \$15.00 increase in the annual assessment to offset this deficit. If the annual assessment remains at its current level with no increase, it is anticipated that the Board will use its reserve funds to offset this deficit

Board Activities

During the year 2004, the Disciplinary Board met six (6) times. All of these meetings were two day sessions, combining administrative and executive business. At its executive sessions, the Board adjudicated 69 proceedings involving formal charges, which is an increase of 12 from the number of proceedings adjudicated in 2003. Of the 69 major adjudications, 44 were referred to the Supreme Court, together with the Board's Report and Recommendations. In addition to our regularly scheduled meetings, three member Board panels heard oral argument in 11 matters. In one matter, a single Board Member conducted a hearing on a petition to dissolve a temporary suspension, and in another matter a single Board Member conducted a hearing on a petition to revoke probation. Three Member Review Panels considered recommendations for summary Private Reprimands in 19 cases, and considered appeals by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel from Reviewing Hearing Committee Member determinations in 2 cases. 39 respondents appeared before three Member Board Panels to receive Private Reprimands. Finally,

individual Board Members reviewed and approved the filing of 2 petitions for emergency temporary suspension with the Supreme Court.

In addition to the matters considered at the regularly scheduled sessions of the Board in 2004, the Board Chair filed Reports with the Supreme Court recommending the reinstatement of 60 attorneys who had been on inactive status for more than three years, had never been suspended or disbarred, and who had filed petitions for reinstatement to active status. This was an increase of 17 over the number received and approved in 2003.

At the Board's request, the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, our new Executive Director and the Secretary of the Board have taken steps to expedite the disposition of complaints. The Board recognizes that complainants and respondents deserve to have their cases handled in a timely manner. A number of changes in procedures and productivity have served to reduce significantly the time it takes to process a case.

Board Committee Activities

Rules Committee

The Rules Committee was extremely active in 2004. It considered amendments to various Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct, Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and Disciplinary Board Rules and Procedures.

During 2004, the Board published Notices of Proposed Rulemaking, soliciting comments on proposed amendments to the following Rules:

1) Amendments to Rule of Professional Conduct 1.15 relating to Safekeeping of Property – four (4) comments received;

2) Amendments to the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement relating to Confidentiality of Disciplinary Proceedings – fifty (50) comments received;

3) Amendments to the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement relating to Foreign Legal Consultants – four (4) comments received;

4) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 215 relating to Discipline on Consent – no comments received; and,

5) Amendments to the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement relating to Organization of Hearing Committees – no comments received.

In addition to the above-proposed amendments, the following rule changes were approved by either the Board or the Supreme Court in 2004:

Pa.R.P.C. 1.19 – New Rule 1.19 and an amendment to the *Comment* to Rule 1.6 of the Rules of Professional Conduct were approved by the Supreme Court and took effect on January 3, 2004. Rule 1.19 requires lawyers acting as lobbyists to comply with

registration and disclosure laws, regulations or rules enacted by the executive or legislative branches of state government; authorize disclosure of information related to client representation in order to comply with disclosure laws; and reiterates that all such compliance actions by a lawyer-lobbyist must be consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Pa.R.D.E. 208(f) and 214(d) were amended effective March 20, 2004 to require: 1) that the Secretary of the Disciplinary Board be served with a copy of any petition to dissolve or amend an order of temporary suspension; 2) that the time period to hold the hearing runs from service of the Petition on the Secretary; and 3) that the time periods set forth in the amended rules are calculated based on business days.

Pa.R.P.C. 5.5 and 8.5 and the Pa.R.D.E. were amended effective May 15, 2004 to authorize the multijurisdictional practice of law. The changes followed closely the amendments on this subject to the Model Rules of Professional Conduct and the Model Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement adopted by the American Bar Association.

Pa.R.D.E. 102(a), 205(c), 206(a) – (c), 213(d) and 218(c) were amended effective September 25, 2004 to change the organization of hearing committees by classifying members by their experience and ranking them as senior, experienced or new members. Only senior or experienced members are permitted to perform certain functions under the Rules.

Pa.R.D.E. 213 was amended effective December 11, 2004 to provide a procedure to seek review of a hearing committee member's determination on the validity of a subpoena and to establish time periods in which to do so.

"Ethics 2000" Changes to the Rules of Professional Conduct were approved by the Supreme Court in August 2004, and took effect on January 1, 2005. These changes were derived from the national recommendations of the American Bar Association, some of which recommendations were influenced by Pennsylvania's experience. The new rules preserve some existing rules specific to our Commonwealth's experience and culture or that require conformity with existing statutes, thus achieving an appropriate balance between state and national practices.

Pa.R.P.C. 1.18 was adopted by the Supreme Court effective January 6, 2005. This new rule clarifies that a lawyer who consults with a prospective client must treat the information learned during the consultation as confidential information that may not be revealed except as allowed under the exceptions to a lawyer's duty of confidentiality.

Pa.R.D.E. 102, 201, 203, 204, 212, 216, 217, 219 and 512 and Pa.R.P.C. 5.5 were amended by Order of the Supreme Court dated March 17, 2005 to conform with recent Pennsylvania Bar Admission Rule changes to provide for the limited admission of in-house corporate counsel and military attorneys. This Order also included amendments relating to foreign legal consultants, which will take effect on September 1, 2005, at the same time that Pa.B.A.R. 341 and 342 become effective.

Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Board were amended by the Disciplinary Board effective February 21, 2004, to make conforming changes to the Board's Rules to reflect the adoption of amendments to Pa.R.D.E. 203(b), 207(b), 208(b) and 218(c).

Rules of Organization and Procedure of the Board were amended by the Disciplinary Board effective September 11, 2004 to make conforming changes to the Board's Rules to reflect the adoption of amendments to Pa.R.D.E. 208(f)(4), 214(d)(4), 201 and 216.

Finance & Pension Committee

In 2004, the Finance and Pension Committee periodically reviewed the performance of the invested funds being managed by the Board's three investment firms, as well as the performance of the pension funds managed by PNC Advisors. In addition, the Committee reviewed and approved the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2004-2005 and established the late payment penalties and returned check fees for attorney registration.

Effective January 1, 2004, the Disciplinary Board staff joined the Pennsylvania Judiciary's medical benefits plan. Although the judiciary's medical benefits were similar to those offered to employees of the Disciplinary Board, the primary reason for the Board's request to join the Court's plan was to better control the rising costs of medical insurance through joining a larger group. Although the Disciplinary Board is self-funded through the attorney's annual fees, the relatively small size of the staff and geographic location of the offices limited the Board's options with medical providers, as is evidenced by the 23% increase in medical insurance premiums on July 1, 2003. Since joining the judiciary's plan, the Board has neutralized any additional increases in medical insurance costs through employee co-payments, and has reimbursed the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts for the Board's insurance costs.

During the 2004 calendar year, the Finance and Pension Committee also analyzed the costs associated with hiring a full-time court reporter to service the District I and II Offices. The Committee found that the cost of providing salary and benefits for this employee would be higher than the expenses the Board currently pays the court reporting firm used to attend and transcribe the notes of testimony for the hearings held in those two District Offices.

The committee also studied the possibility of assessing an annual fee for inactive attorneys as a way of generating more revenues to offset the Board's increased expenses. It reviewed a survey compiled by the New Jersey Office of Attorney Ethics, which reported that 37 jurisdictions in the United States charge inactive fees. The committee also examined rules from three other jurisdictions with a comparable number of licensed attorneys. Two of those jurisdictions suspended attorneys who failed to pay their annual fees. The committee recommended to the Board that an annual fee be imposed on inactive attorneys, that retired attorneys be exempt from payment of inactive fees, and that the Enforcement Rules be amended to provide that failure to pay either the active or inactive annual fees would result in the attorney being suspended from the practice of law.

In July 2003, the Board was notified by the Supreme Court of the establishment of the Investment Advisory Board (“IAB”). The IAB is responsible for developing an investment policy and selecting an investment firm to implement the policy. In addition, the IAB will develop policies and procedures to ensure that each participating Board’s normal operations are not adversely affected by this new investment structure. The IAB consists of one representative from each of the three initially participating Boards, plus four members, including the Chair, appointed by the Supreme Court. The Court Administrator of Pennsylvania serves in an *ex officio* and tie-breaking capacity. The three Court-affiliated Boards involved are the Disciplinary Board, the PA Lawyers Fund for Client Security Board and the PA Continuing Legal Education Board. Board Member Donald E. Wright, Jr., Esquire, was named as the Disciplinary Board’s representative. In late 2004, an investment consultant was selected, and it is expected that the transition into a pooled investment account will be completed before July 1, 2005.

Education Committee

The Education Committee prepared and presented the program at the Board’s annual Training Session and Refresher Course for all Hearing Committee Members on September 27, 2004 in Hershey. 140 Hearing Committee Members were in attendance at the program.

The Education Committee also designed the Program for the Board’s Retreat Meeting in July 2004. The topics were Professional Liability Insurance and Discipline on Consent. Ellyn Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel with the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility, was the Board’s guest speaker for the Discipline on Consent topic. Ms. Rosen provided the Board with a chart compiled by the Michigan Attorney Discipline Board, which conducted a poll of other jurisdictions to determine which of them had provisions for discipline on consent. Of the 27 jurisdictions that responded, Pennsylvania was the only one which limited discipline on consent to disbarments. As a result of its deliberations at the Retreat Meeting, the Board developed and recommended to the Court proposed rules to establish a procedure for discipline on consent.

Communications Committee

In July 2003, the Board established a Communications Committee. The role of this committee is to provide oversight of the Board’s new website, and to explore ways of improving communications with the general public, attorneys, law students and other interested parties.

In January 2004, the Board entered into an agreement with Hershey Philbin Associates (HPA) for consultation services. The goal of this consulting arrangement, as defined by HPA, is as follows: to educate the general public on using the Board’s website database as a resource to see whether an attorney has received public discipline; to explain how to receive help if a person believes he or she has been mistreated by an attorney; to position the purpose of the Disciplinary Board not as an organization to punish

attorneys but rather one that ensures the integrity of professional legal services; to build confidence that the disciplinary system is effective and does a good job of policing itself; and to promote the understanding that the Disciplinary Board is funded by lawyers and is not a public agency. With respect to attorneys, HPA's goal is to elevate the perception of the Board among the legal community, creating a sense of respect for the role it performs; to create the knowledge that the disciplinary system in Pennsylvania is very effective; to educate attorneys on the disciplinary system, how it works and how to use it, provide education in ethics and professional regulations to prevent attorneys from inadvertently violating the rules; and clarify the roles of the Board and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

In 2004, HPA issued numerous press releases; researched and developed an extensive media database designed to reach targeted audiences; worked with "Blue Page" directories to include the Office of Disciplinary Counsel regional offices in appropriate telephone directories and contact help lines; conducted an analysis of Pennsylvania's disciplinary system versus those of other comparable jurisdictions; consulted with the Board Chair and Chief Disciplinary Counsel regarding negative publicity in the Pittsburgh area; made contact with each County Bar in an effort to provide continual communications; made recommendations for upgrading the Board's website in order to make it more user-friendly – especially for consumers; developed a concept for an e-newsletter which will educate and inform attorneys on various aspects of the Rules of Professional Conduct; and redesigned and rewrote the on-line consumer brochure to make it reflect the professional image of the Disciplinary Board and to communicate easily to consumers.

In August 2004, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel presented an Ethics School CLE satellite program in Pittsburgh. Two one-hour courses were offered which were titled "Overview of the PA Disciplinary System" and "Myths and Safekeeping Client Property and Trust Accounts". Although the Board is not prepared at this time to present these types of courses on a regular basis due to the additional costs and staff time it would require, efforts are being made to incorporate these two subjects into existing CLE programs.

In 2004, the Communications Committee Chair, Robert C. Saidis, Esquire, was also assigned the task of reviewing written requests from attorneys seeking no public access to their address information either by written communications or via the Board's website. Mr. Saidis reviewed these requests and recommended that 53 requests for no public access be granted, and 17 be denied for lack of good cause.

Disciplinary Board Website

On June 25, 2003, the Disciplinary Board launched its new website at www.padisciplinaryboard.org. This website offers a wealth of information for consumers and lawyers, and gives visitors the ability to easily search Pennsylvania attorney registration records, to verify address information and an attorney's current status, verify which lawyers are in good standing, and to ascertain whether a lawyer has ever been publicly disciplined. The public discipline section contains links directly to the Board Reports posted on the Supreme Court's website, where a report is available. We are advised that a number of the courts in the Commonwealth are also finding this site useful in verifying information concerning attorneys appearing before them.

Consumers may also learn how to file a complaint against a lawyer and download the complaint form in English or Spanish. In addition, lawyers can find answers to frequently asked questions concerning attorney registration, reinstatement and disciplinary procedures, download copies of the current rules and forms for attorney registration and reinstatement, and view Notices of Proposed Rulemaking pertaining to rule amendments being proposed by the Board. Viewers can also subscribe to the Board's E-Mail newsletter.

Hearing Committees

In October 2004, the hearing committees were restructured as a result of the Enforcement Rule amendments adopted by the Supreme Court effective September 25, 2004. The amended rules eliminated the "numbered" committees, such as Hearing Committee 1.01 or 1.02, and instead empowered the Board to assign formal hearings to committees within a disciplinary district, using all available committee members. Members were ranked based on their experience. Senior Members are those who have completed one full term as a member and who have also conducted at least three hearings which required the preparation of transcripts and preparation of full reports to the Board. Experienced Members are those who have completed at least one full year of service and who have conducted at least one hearing which required preparation of a transcript and a full report to the Board. New Members are those who are either still in their first year of service and/or have not yet had a full hearing.

The new rules governing the appointment of committees to hear cases require that the committee be composed of at least one Senior Member, and that one of the other members be either a Senior or an Experienced Member. The Board designates a Senior member to chair the committee. Only a Senior or Experienced Member is permitted to conduct the mandatory prehearing conference required in disciplinary matters. The Board Chair designates the member to conduct the Prehearing Conference in his or her Scheduling Order, which is enclosed with the referral of the case to the committee.

The Secretary's Office has a new database which keeps track of the number of cases heard by an individual member, and the years of service for each member. Therefore, members can be automatically promoted in rank when they qualify and are so notified by the Secretary.

In addition to reorganizing the Hearing Committees, we have also made changes in the procedures for scheduling hearings. At the same time the three committee members are selected, they are contacted by telephone and prehearing and hearing dates are set. If one of the members is not available, the staff in the Secretary's Office will call another member who is available on the dates selected. The Notices of Prehearing and Hearing are sent to the parties and the committee at the same time the assignment is made. This has eliminated the undue delays in scheduling that the Board has experienced in the past.

As of December 31, 2004, there were 89 Senior Members, 67 Experienced Members and 40 New Members appointed by the Disciplinary Board, all of whom serve on a pro bono basis to conduct hearings.

Other Highlights in 2004

In February 2004, then Board Member and now Vice-Chair Marvin J. Rudnitsky, and Elaine Bixler, the Secretary of the Board, attended the First Annual Meeting of the National Council of Lawyer Disciplinary Boards (NCLDB) in San Antonio, Texas. The morning portion of the program dealt with recruiting, training and supporting the volunteer Board Members and hearing committee members. Mr. Rudnitsky was a presenter on the panel for that portion of the program. The afternoon session dealt with the topic of discipline by consent. At the Council's business meeting, officers for the ensuing year were elected. Ms. Bixler was elected to the Board of Directors of the NCLDB.

In March 2004, the Board began a search for an administrative staff person to assist in the day-to-day management of the Office of the Secretary. An Ad Hoc Committee, comprised of Board Members Robert E. J. Curran, Robert C. Saidis and Smith Barton Gephart, was appointed to review the job descriptions of existing support staff, interview staff members, identify the areas where additional assistance was needed, work with Ms. Bixler in drafting a job description, and commencing a search for qualified candidates. The Board placed an advertisement in the Harrisburg Patriot News and posted the position opening on the Supreme Court's website. The Board initially listed the new position as Deputy Director of Administrative Affairs and sought applicants with experience in budgeting and financial matters, knowledge of modern office management methods and personnel administration and an ability to develop and install administrative procedures and operations. Interested applicants were requested to send their resumes and salary requirements to the Board by July 12, 2004. After consulting with the Supreme Court, the Board subsequently revised the job description to create the position of Executive Director of the Board and determined that the executive staff be restructured.

The Board received 168 resumes, and after extensive review and screening, the Committee, the Chair and Vice-Chair interviewed 10 candidates. Joseph W. Farrell was hired as the Executive Director on November 8, 2004. As Executive Director, Mr. Farrell is responsible for all administrative functions associated with the Office of the Board, including attorney registration functions, personnel administration, budgeting, and managing other financial matters. He has extensive management experience, having served as Deputy Executive Director of Administration and Enforcement for the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and having held the position of Manager of the Executive Office for Customer Advocacy at First Energy since 1998. Ms. Bixler remains as Secretary of the Board

The past twelve months were very active ones for the Board Chair. During the summer and early fall of 2004, he was called upon numerous times to speak to various County Bar Associations regarding the Board's proposal to "open" the disciplinary system at the time of filing of formal charges. These opportunities to appear before the leadership of County Bars enabled the Board to enhance its communications efforts with members of the Bar, and to assist in the educational process regarding the disciplinary system in Pennsylvania. There were also numerous opportunities to respond to inquiries from the press regarding the Board's proposals, thus enhancing opportunities to educate the public about the disciplinary system in Pennsylvania. A few Board representatives met with the

officers of the Pennsylvania Bar Association in July, 2004, along with our respective executive staff members, and the Chair also addressed the PBA Board of Governors at its August, 2004 meeting. The Chair and Vice-Chair presented a CLE program in State College to a PBA Young Lawyers group, and I participated with Mr. Justice Eakin and Paul J. Killion, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, in a program about the disciplinary process at the Conference of County Bar Leaders meeting in State College in March, 2005. The Chair also made a presentation to the Chester County Inns of Court regarding the disciplinary process in Pennsylvania, and consulted with many lawyers regarding the proposals that the Board has presented to the Court regarding changes in the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and the Rules of Professional Conduct.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Board Members Serving During 2004

- Richard W. Stewart, Esq., Board Chair until Retirement on 4/1/2004
- * J. Michele Peck, Retirement on 4/1/2004
 - Martin W. Sheerer, Esq.
 - * C. Eugene McLaughlin
 - Marvin J. Rudnitsky, Appointed Board Vice-Chair 4/1/2004
 - Louis N. Teti, Esq., Appointed Board Chair 4/1/2004
 - Robert E. J. Curran, Esq.
 - Donald E. Wright, Jr., Esq.
 - Robert C. Saidis, Esq.
 - Jonathan H. Newman, Esq.
 - Marc S. Raspanti, Esq.
 - Laurence H. Brown, Esq.
 - Smith Barton Gephart, Esq.
 - Gary G. Gentile, Esq.
 - Francis X. O'Connor, Esq.
 - Lori A. Flickstein, Esq., Resigned 2/19/2004
 - Min S. Suh, Esq., Appointed 2/19/2004
 - William A. Pietragallo, Esq., Appointed 4/1/2004
 - * Nikki P. Nordenberg, Appointed 4/5/2004

*non-lawyer members

Principal Staff Member/Contact Person

Joseph W. Farrell
Executive Director
Phone: (717) 731-7073

CITATION OF AUTHORITY AND DEFINITION OF BOARD'S FUNCTION

Rule 103. Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement.

The Supreme Court declares that it has inherent and exclusive power to supervise the conduct of attorneys who are its officers and in furtherance thereof promulgates these rules.

(Power is reasserted in Section 10(c) of Article V of the Constitution of Pennsylvania.)

Rule 205(a). Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement.

The Supreme Court shall appoint a board to be known as "The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania" which shall be composed of fourteen (14) members of the Bar of this Commonwealth and two (2) non-lawyer electors. One of the members shall be designed by the Court as Chair and another as Vice-Chair.

* * * * *

Rule 205(c). Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement.

The Board shall have the power and duty:

(1) To consider and investigate the conduct of any person subject to these rules and may initiate any such investigation on its own motion or may undertake the same upon complaint by any person.

(2) To appoint a Secretary, a Chief Disciplinary Counsel, and such assistant disciplinary counsel and staff as may from time to time be required to properly perform the functions prescribed by these rules.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
Calendar Years

1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989

Disciplinary Cases:

1. Informal Admonition	37	55	95	81	96	102	121	98	113	156	137	125	123	101	110	106	123
2. Private Reprimand	0	7	8	9	7	14	5	5	4	6	9	21	19	27	17	25	31
3. Probation	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Public Censure	0	2	5	8	10	7	6	1	1	2	6	1	3	2	3	0	2
5. Suspension	3	12	12	8	10	13	17	8	17	12	7	7	16	5	10	17	17
6. Disbarment	3	4	6	5	13	6	12	12	21	33	24	21	16	29	23	32	18
Total Disciplinary Actions	43	80	126	111	138	143	161	124	156	209	183	175	177	164	163	180	191

Reinstatement Cases:

1. Granted	1	2	2	3	3	4	2	6	42	21	22	25	21	17	24	34	27
2. Denied	1	2	2	0	0	3	1	5	4	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	0

1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 Total

Disciplinary Cases:

1. Informal Admonition	98	115	82	85	75	74	70	106	88	48	45	40	54	58	106	2,923
2. Private Reprimand	26	46	42	30	41	48	31	46	43	26	29	35	32	36	34	759
3. Probation	1	1	7	5	5	7	3	8	5	7	3	10	8	8	20	101
4. Public Censure	1	4	1	0	1	6	3	3	7	4	0	2	2	1	1	95
5. Suspension	18	10	20	12	23	26	37	33	24	23	30	27	29	31	38 [•]	572
6. Disbarment	26	27	38	20	32	35	41	40	33	29	32	31	42	38	37 [♣]	779
Total Disciplinary Actions	170	203	190	152	177	196	185	236	200	137	139	145	167	173	236	5,229

Reinstatement Cases:

1. Granted	34	35	27	29	24	44	31	35	33	45	35	55	64	58	75 [*]	822
2. Denied	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	2	3	4	4	2 [‡]	46

• This figure does not include **11** temporary suspensions (Rule 214 Pa.R.D.E.) and **4** temporary suspensions (Rule 208(f) Pa.R.D.E.)

♣ This figure includes **27** disbarments on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.)

* This figure includes **63** reinstatements to active status after being inactive three years or more, **9** reinstatements after having been suspended, and **3** reinstatement after having been disbarred.

‡ This figure includes **0** denied reinstatement after having been suspended and **2** after having been disbarred.

Number of Registered Attorneys in PA

