Report of the Work of
The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 5600, PO Box 62625, Harrisburg, PA 17106-2625
For the Year 2011

Budget

For Fiscal Year 2010-2011, the Board's revenues totaled $10,069,432 and expenses totaled $9,276,787. After factoring in the unrealized gain on investments of $1,481,553, revenues exceeded expenditures by $2,274,198. The Board's invested funds experienced unrealized losses of $737,052 in 2008-2009 and $288,119 in 2007-2008 and saw gains of $601,650 in 2005-2006, $1,080,873 in 2006-2007, and $1,476,300 in 2009-2010, respectively.

On February 9, 2011, the annual Lawyer Assessment Committee telephone conference call took place. At that time, the Board submitted a Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012, which proposed a .65% decrease in its Budget and projected that expenses would exceed revenues by approximately $190,776. The Disciplinary Board recommended that the reallocation of annual fees for the Disciplinary Board and the PA Lawyers Fund remain at $140.00 per attorney for the Disciplinary Board and at $35.00 per attorney for the Lawyers Fund.

However, the Pennsylvania Lawyers Fund for Client Security asked that the allocation be changed to increase their portion of the fee to $40.00 per attorney. By Order dated April 8, 2011, the Supreme Court approved a reallocation of the annual fees at $135.00 per attorney for the Disciplinary Board and $40.00 per attorney for the Lawyers Fund.

In an effort to save on expenses, the Disciplinary Board reduced the number of Board Meetings from five to four in calendar year 2011.

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 **58,968** active and **11,296** inactive paid attorneys as of December 31, 2011.

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 2011, **4,598** new complaints were received by the ODC. **4,666** complaints were disposed of during the year, **270** of which resulted in discipline. 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 2011, the Supreme Court ordered the disbarment of **32** attorneys and suspension of **49** attorneys for periods ranging up to five

years (this does not include 13 attorneys who received interim temporary suspensions). Due to the fact that a number of disciplinary matters involve multiple complaints of misconduct against that attorney, the number of complaints resulting in discipline will not equal the total disciplinary actions taken in any given year.

Discipline on Consent

Effective June 11, 2005, the Supreme Court approved amendments to Rule 215, Pa.R.D.E. In July 2005, the Board established a procedure for three-member panels to review Joint Petitions for Discipline on Consent. When Joint Petitions are filed with the Board, they are assigned to three-member panels to review and either approve or deny the Joint Petitions. When a decision is made, the Panel Chair returns the signed Recommendation page to the Board Secretary. If the Joint Petition is approved, the Secretary's office notifies the respondent-attorney of the approval and that the necessary expenses must be paid as a condition to the grant of the Petition. The respondent-attorney is given ten days in which to do so. Upon receipt of payment, the Panel's Recommendation is forwarded to the Supreme Court, if the joint recommendation is for some form of public discipline.

During the 2011 year, **34** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board. **9** of those joint petitions were filed prior to scheduled disciplinary hearings. **20** joint petitions were approved and **4** were denied. Of those approved, **10** resulted in private discipline and **10** resulted in public discipline. As of December 31, 2011, **10** of the joint petitions filed in 2011 were not yet final.

Since consent discipline was adopted in Pennsylvania in 2005, **214** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board.

Board Activities

During the year 2011, the Disciplinary Board met four (4) times. All of these meetings combined administrative and executive business. At its executive sessions, the Board adjudicated **64** proceedings involving formal charges, which is an increase of **18** from the number of proceedings adjudicated in 2010. Of the 64 major adjudications, **54** were referred to the Supreme Court, together with the Board's Report and Recommendations. In addition to regularly scheduled meetings, three-member Board panels heard oral argument in **12** matters. Three-member review panels considered recommendations for summary Private Reprimands in **10** cases and considered **1** appeal by the ODC from a Reviewing Hearing Committee Member determination. **20** respondents appeared before three-member Board panels to receive private reprimands. Finally, **2** Board Members conducted probation violation hearings and **1** Board Member reviewed a petition for emergency temporary suspension.

In May 2009, Rule 218, Pa.R.D.E. was amended to provide a new procedure for attorneys petitioning for reinstatement from inactive or retired status for more than three years. The new Rule provides that if ODC has no objection to the reinstatement and files a certification with the Board Secretary stating that after review of the petition and reasonably diligent inquiry, they have determined that there is no impediment to reinstatement and the petitioning attorney will meet his or her burden of proof under the Rule if the petition were to proceed to hearing, the petition and certification are referred to a member to the Board for review and to issue a report and recommendation in accordance with the Rule. If the assigned Board Member approves the reinstatement, the matter is forwarded to the Deputy Prothonotary of the Western District of the Supreme Court.

In 2011, Board Members reviewed and approved **88** reinstatements from inactive status, a decrease of **8** from the prior year. In addition, this new procedure cuts down the processing time on these types of reinstatements from an average of six months to about three months. The costs charged to the petitioning attorney are also drastically reduced due to the elimination of the need for a hearing and the reduced number of copies being filed with the Court.

In October 2011, the Board adopted yet another procedure to expedite the processing of reinstatements from inactive status, retired status or administrative suspension. In cases where the ODC initially opposes one of these reinstatements and either at the hearing or after the hearing committee member files his/her report withdraws their objection, the case will be assigned to a single Board Member for review. If the Board Member approves the reinstatement, a report is drafted and the matter is forwarded to the Supreme Court. If the Board Member has concerns, the matter will be held over to the next scheduled meeting of the Board for consideration.

At the request of the Board, the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, the Executive Director and the Secretary of the Board have taken steps to speed up the disposition of complaints. The Board is cognizant of the fact that complainants and respondents deserve to have cases handled in a timely manner. A number of changes in procedures and productivity have served to significantly cut down the time it takes to process a case.

Board Committee Activities

Rules Committee

During 2011, the Board published Notices of Proposed Rulemaking soliciting comments on proposed amendments to the following Rules:

1) Amendments to Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 218 and 219 (relating to reinstatement procedures and annual attorney registration), published for comment on May 21, 2011, comments due July 1, 2011 – no comments were received.

2) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 214 (relating to self-reporting a conviction of any crime, and authorizing ODC to commence prosecution while the conviction is pending in the Supreme Court), published for comment on September 10, 2011, comments due October 12, 2011 – three comments were received.

3) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 204(a) (relating to public reprimand as new type of discipline), published for comment on August 6, 2011, comments due September 30, 2011 – one comment was received.

In addition to the above proposed amendments, the following rule changes were approved in 2011:

Pa.R.D.E. 514(b) – Amended effective January 17, 2011 to increase the maximum amount which may be disbursed from the PA Lawyers Fund for Client Security to any one claimant with respect to the dishonest conduct of an attorney from $75,000 to $100,000.

Pa.R.D.E. 301(e) - Amended effective February 2, 2011 to require that a certificate of admission of disability filed by an attorney who is suffering from a disability by reason of mental or physical infirmity or illness or because of addiction to drugs or intoxicants, which makes it impossible for the respondent to prepare an adequate defense to disciplinary charges, must attach an opinion of at least one medical expert containing the basis for the medical expert's opinion. Upon receipt of the certificate, the Court may order that the respondent be examined by a medical expert if they find the certificate does not comply with the Rule. However, if it does, the respondent is immediately placed on disability inactive status.

Pa.R.D.E. 205(c) – Amended effective April 15, 2011 to make it clear that the duty of the Board is not to investigate complaints against attorneys but to adjudicate matters brought before it by the ODC, which has the duty to investigate under Rule 207(b).

Pa.R.D.E. 203(b) – Amended effective June 25, 2011 to provide that failure by a respondent-attorney without good cause to respond to ODC's request or supplemental request for a statement of the respondent-attorney's position, shall be grounds for discipline.

Pa.R.D.E. 209(a) – Amended effective July 14, 2011 to mirror the language used in Rule 12 of the ABA Model Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement and consistent with the Opinion filed July 22, 2010, by the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Stilp v. Contino, 613 F.3d 405 (3d. Cir. 2010)

Amendments to Board Rules of Organization and Procedure- Order No. 72 adopted effective August 6, 2011 made conforming amendments consistent with the amendments made to the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement to Rules 208(f)(1), 203, 214, 216, 219, 214, 301, 205, 219, 203 and 209, respectively.

At the time of the filing of this annual report, four additional proposed orders amending the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and the Rules of Professional Conduct were pending before the Supreme Court.

Finance & Pension Committee

In early 2011, the Disciplinary Board approved structural changes to its Pension Plan at the recommendation of the Finance & Pension Committee. The changes were twofold: the fund manager was changed from PNC Advisors to Fulton Financial Advisors, and the plan became a participant-directed plan. All employees met with an investment advisor, who answered questions and assisted them in selecting their individual retirement funds.

The Committee reviewed and approved the proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 and established a two-tiered late payment penalty of $100 at the time the Final Notices were mailed to attorneys, and which increased to $200 at the time the list of delinquent attorneys was forwarded to the Supreme Court. The Committee established the returned check fee at $50. The Committee also reviewed the audit performed by the Board's auditors, KPMG LLP.

In December 2011, the Committee also met with representatives from KPMG to discuss the audit and with a representative from Conrad Siegel, the Board's pension actuary to review any needed changes and/or amendments to the Board's pension plan.

In July 2003, the Board was notified by the Supreme Court of the establishment of the Investment Advisory Board ("IAB"). The IAB was established to assist the Supreme Court in its oversight and consolidation of investment portfolios that would enhance returns and reduce investment fees. The IAB developed an investment policy and selected an investment firm to implement the policy. In September 2005, the Supreme Court adopted Rules setting forth responsibilities and procedures to ensure that each participating Board's normal operations would not be adversely affected by this new investment structure. Effective July 1, 2005, the Administrative Office of the Supreme Court began investing the Board's funds in the consolidated account through PNC Advisors. The IAB consists of one representative from each of the participating Boards and four members appointed by the Supreme Court. The Court Administrator of Pennsylvania serves in an *ex officio* and tie-breaking capacity. The four Court-affiliated Boards involved are the Disciplinary Board, the PA Lawyers Fund for Client Security Board, the PA Continuing Legal Education Board, and the Pennsylvania Board of Law Examiners.

Carl D. Buchholz, III, currently serves as the Disciplinary Board's representative on the IAB. Throughout the year, he updated the Board on the performance of the funds invested through the IAB.

Education Committee

The Education Committee designed the program for the Board's Educational Meeting in July 2011. The topic was "The Role of Education in the Disciplinary Process". This included an in-depth discussion about the Bridge the Gap program, how it began, where it is now and what is in the future. The Guest Speaker for this topic was C. Dan Levering, Executive Director of the PA CLE Board. Board Members voiced their appreciation to Mr. Levering for the detailed history and outline of how the current program works.

The Board also did a statistical study of Rule violations vs. the number of years the attorneys were in practice and found, surprisingly, that it is not the newly admitted, younger attorneys who are engaging in the most common Rule violations, it is attorneys who have more than 20 years of practice. As a result, the Board is of the opinion that an educational course should be developed specifically for attorneys who engage in misconduct. In the meantime, the Board determined to amend its schedule of courses required for reinstatement to provide that attorneys who are disbarred and suspended and who are seeking reinstatement, must take the Bridge the Gap course through an accredited PA CLE provider as part of the 36 hours of credits required to file for reinstatement. This change took effect December 1, 2011.

Finally, Board Members received their new laptop computers and received training on how to access the new Disciplinary Board SharePoint Site to review case files. More on this topic will be discussed later in this report.

The Education Committee also designed the program used at the Training Session for New Hearing Committee Members held on October 19, 2011 in Hershey. **47** Hearing Committee Members attended the program. The program started with Ken Hagreen, Executive Director of Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers, who discussed the science of addiction and mental health monitoring. Board Members and staff presented the topics.

In October 2011, the Education Committee and a number of other interested Board Members met with Ken Hagreen to continue discussions relating to an educational course targeted at attorneys who engage in misconduct. Mr. Hagreen recommended the Committee frame out the concept, come up with a plan and select six topics directed at the most common areas where violations occur. The Committee is continuing to develop this idea and there are plans for this to be one of the topics at the Board's Educational Meeting in July 2012.

Communications Committee

The role of the Communications Committee is to provide oversight to the Board's Website and to explore ways of improving communications with the general public, attorneys, law students and others.

In July 2008, the Board retained Suasion as its communications firm. Their primary function is to provide support for the Board's website and distribute the monthly Attorney E-Newsletter. As of December 31, 2011, there were 57,527 subscribers to the monthly Attorney E-Newsletter, an increase of 9,799 from 2010.

In 2011, Suasion created additional PDF fillable forms for attorney registration and reinstatement which enable attorneys to type the information in the forms online and print the final product. They updated a number of items and Rules on the website at the request of staff, and identified links that weren't working properly and relinked them. They wrote and distributed press releases and articles concerning online attorney registration and appointments and reappointments to the Disciplinary Board. They drafted and distributed an email blast directed to the county bar associations about the Chief Justice's call to action for pro bono services across the Commonwealth and drafted and distributed three email blasts to attorneys concerning online attorney registration.

In the latter part of 2011, the Board reduced the duties of Suasion. In future, they are not to prepare any press releases, and they should not act as the spokesperson for the Board with the press. Future press releases will be prepared by the staff in the Administrative Office of PA Courts.

Disciplinary Board Website

On June 25, 2003, the Disciplinary Board launched its Website at www.padisciplinaryboard.org. In 2005, the Board purchased two additional domain names (www.padboard.org and www.padb.us) in an effort to provide easier access to the site.

In June 2006, the Board launched its redesigned website with the goal of making it more consumer friendly. The site features an attorney section, a consumer section, and an attorney look up section. The attorney section provides forms for registration and reinstatement, information on registration and reinstatement procedures, options to look up attorneys, frequently asked questions, current copies of the Rules, and other attorney related information. The consumer section allows consumers to look up attorneys, explains the process for filing a complaint, provides downloadable copies of the complaint form and informational brochures, and provides information to better understand how the disciplinary system works. The attorney look up section, which can be accessed directly from the Home page allows users to easily search registered Pennsylvania attorneys to verify public address information, the attorney's current status, date of admission, a history of public discipline, if any, and whether there are any public proceedings pending against that attorney.

In 2007, the Board added a new component to its website to assure the public is informed of recent Supreme Court actions taken against attorneys. The new Recent Discipline tab is on the Board's Home page, and one click on the tab takes users to a Table which lists the discipline against attorneys during the last 60 days. The table contains the attorney's name, the date of the order, action taken, and, where available, a link to the Board's report or joint petition for discipline on consent. Within 24 business hours after a

Supreme Court Order is entered, the case will be added to the table. Users can also access discipline going back to 2004, and these tables can easily be sorted by date, attorney last name, type of action taken, the county where the attorney is located and by attorney ID number.

In 2011, **95,724** unique visitors accessed the site, and an average of **548,974** visitors accessed the site during the year. Multiple visits by the same person/computer are counted multiple times. The top pages visited were: Look up Attorney, Attorney Home Page and Recent Supreme Court Actions.

Hearings and Hearing Committees

In October 2004, the hearing committee organization was re-structured to give the Board the ability to assign formal hearings to committees within a disciplinary district using all available committee members. Members were ranked based on their experience. In addition to reorganizing the Hearing Committees, the Board has 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 can call another member to find someone 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 the Board experienced in the past.

New procedures were put in place to try to eliminate overdue Hearing Committee Reports. After the briefing schedule has passed, the members of the Hearing Committee are sent a reminder letter by the Board Secretary giving them the due date for the Report. In addition, a week or two before the Report is due, Counsel to the Board places a reminder phone call to the Committee Chair reminding him or her of the upcoming due date and offering assistance, if needed. Since the establishment of this new procedure, there have been very few Board Meetings where any Hearing Committee Reports were reported as overdue.

In August 2005, the Board launched a Website exclusively for the use of Hearing Committee Members. This site offers sample hearing committee reports, orders and other documents, Word templates for the preparation of all types of committee reports, as well as travel expense and other forms. The Website also includes a research section which contains links to published Board Reports, recent Supreme Court Opinions and current copies of the Rules.

Due to the decreasing number of cases requiring hearings before Hearing Committees and in an effort to reduce expenses, it was decided by the Board not to replace those Members whose terms expired on July 1, 2009, and who were not eligible for reappointment. This totaled 28 members.

As of December 31, 2011, there are **150** Hearing Committee Members, consisting of **82** Senior members, **27** Experienced members and **41** New members appointed by the Disciplinary Board who serve on a pro bono basis to conduct hearings.

Other Highlights in 2011

Online Attorney Registration – In the Spring of 2011, the Disciplinary Board launched online Annual Attorney Registration. The system allows attorneys to securely submit registration forms and pay the annual fee to the Attorney Registration Office of the Board. Attorneys can also designate proxies who can then submit the forms and fees for them. Payments are accepted using Visa, MasterCard and Discover, as well as by ATM/Debit cards. Full details and instructions on all the functions available for the Attorney Registration system were available on the UJS Web Portal.

Attorneys who registered an email address with the Attorney Registration Office received email notifications regarding the new online feature. In addition, brochures were included with the paper annual fee forms when they were mailed to attorneys in May 2011. At the close of the registration period, 20% of all registered attorneys used online attorney registration to pay their 2011-2012 Attorney's Annual Fee. Attorneys may elect to not receive paper forms in the future. An electronic notice will be sent to those attorneys at the time registration for the new Fiscal Year opens.

Going Paperless – One of the topics at the February 2011 NCLDB Annual Meeting was Going Paperless. This included discussions relating to electronic filing (eFiling), virtual case files and web training. After that Meeting, the Disciplinary Board began exploring ways to eliminate the paper copies of adjudication folders the Board Members received containing all the pleadings filed in matters coming before the Board. With the generous help of Amy Ceraso and the AOPC IT Department, a SharePoint site was developed under the umbrella of the Unified Judicial System. Board Members are only able to access the site through a web portal by using Board purchased laptop computers that are pre-programmed by the AOPC IT staff with high levels of security. Four volunteer Board Members received the first laptops and tested access to the case materials on the website. They suggested improvements which were implemented.

At the July 22, 2011 Education Meeting, the remaining Board Members received their laptop computers and received hands-on training on how to access their case files by Kelly Ominski from the AOPC, who actually designed the SharePoints site. The October 2011 Board Meeting was the first entirely paperless meeting. The Board feels strongly that the savings in paper, postage and processing time will more than pay for the purchase of laptop computers for the Board Members.

Allen Feingold Conservatorship & Bankruptcy – In February 2011, after a lengthy conservatorship, Judge Chad F. Kenney, Sr., issued a Final Order and Judgment granting the Application for Discharge of the Conservator, the Honorable Russell M. Nigro, directed, among other things, that Allen Feingold pay to the Disciplinary Board the sum of

$44,889.92 upon receipt of the Order. The sum was comprised of outstanding costs owed to the Board relating to the prosecution of four disciplinary matters against him, and $9,375.00 for fees incurred in the Conservatorship. Mr. Feingold subsequently filed for bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Florida. The Board determined to hire counsel from Florida to protect its interests in the bankruptcy proceeding. That matter was still pending at the close of 2011.

Meet & Greet with Respondents' Counsel – On December 20, 2011, six Board Members were able to meet with respondents' counsel in the District I Office in Philadelphia. It was strictly a social gathering, and a number of counsel from the Eastern region, as well as the mid-state were able to attend. It is anticipated that another such function will take place in Pittsburgh when the Board meets there in May 2012.

National Meetings – In February 2011, Board Members, Stewart L. Cohen, R. Burke McLemore, Board Secretary Elaine Bixler and Hearing Coordinator, Marcee Sloan, attended the Eighth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Lawyer Disciplinary Boards (NCLDB) in Atlanta, Georgia.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Board Members Serving During 2011

	Sal Cognetti, Jr., Esq.	Served as Chair 4/1/2011 to 4/1/2012
	Carl D. Buchholz, III, Esq.	Served as Chair 4/1/2010 to 4/6/2011
	Stewart L. Cohen, Esq.	Served as Vice-Chair 4/1/2011 to 4/1/2012
*	Marc S. Baer	Term Expired 12/29/2011
	Charlotte S. Jefferies, Esq.	
	Gerald Lawrence, Esq.	
	David A. Nasatir, Esq.	
	Gabriel L. Bevilacqua, Esq.	
	R. Burke McLemore, Jr., Esq.	
	Albert Momjian, Esq.	
	Stephan K. Todd, Esq.	
	Howell K. Rosenberg, Esq.	

*non-lawyer members

Principal Staff Member/Contact Person

Joseph W. Farrell
Executive Director
Phone: (717) 231-3380

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 eleven members of the Bar of this Commonwealth and two non-lawyer electors. One of the members shall be designated 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 the conduct of any person subject to these rules after investigation by Disciplinary Counsel pursuant to Enforcement Rule 207(b)(1). Complaints filed directly with the Board shall be forwarded to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for assignment to a district office.

> Note: In order to avoid the commingling of prosecutorial and adjudicative functions, which would be a violation of due process, *see Lyness v. Com. of Pa., State Board of Medicine*, 529 Pa. 535, 605 A.2d 1204 (1992), the Office of Disciplinary Counsel is charged with the duty of investigating and prosecuting all disciplinary matters subject to adjudication by the Board. *See* Enforcement Rule 208(a)(1), (a)(2)(iv). Under Enforcement Rule 208(d)(1), Board Members appointed in a matter to review Disciplinary Counsel's charging decisions or recommended disposition are precluded from further participation in that matter.

(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.

(3) To appoint not less than 18 hearing committee members within each disciplinary district. Each person appointed as a hearing committee member for a district shall be a member of the bar of this Commonwealth who maintains an office for the practice of law within that district.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Calendar Years

Calendar Years	Informal Admonition	Private Reprimand	Probation	Public Censure	Suspend	Disbar	Grant Rein.	Deny Rein.	Year-end Totals
1973	37	0	0	0	3	3	1	1	**45**
1974	55	7	0	2	12	4	2	2	**84**
1975	95	8	0	5	12	6	2	2	**130**
1976	81	9	0	8	8	5	3	0	**114**
1977	96	7	2	10	10	13	3	0	**141**
1978	102	14	1	7	13	6	4	3	**150**
1979	121	5	0	6	17	12	2	1	**164**
1980	98	5	0	1	8	12	6	5	**135**
1981	113	4	0	1	17	21	42	4	**202**
1982	156	6	0	2	12	33	21	0	**230**
1983	137	9	0	6	7	24	22	0	**205**
1984	125	21	0	1	7	21	25	2	**202**
1985	123	19	0	3	16	16	21	0	**198**
1986	101	27	0	2	5	29	17	2	**183**
1987	110	17	0	3	10	23	24	1	**188**
1988	106	25	0	0	17	32	34	1	**215**
1989	123	31	0	2	17	18	27	0	**218**
1990	98	26	1	1	18	26	34	1	**205**
1991	115	46	1	4	10	27	35	0	**238**
1992	82	42	7	1	20	38	27	1	**218**
1993	85	30	5	0	12	20	29	1	**182**
1994	75	41	5	1	23	32	24	0	**201**
1995	74	48	7	6	26	35	44	1	**241**
1996	70	31	3	3	37	41	31	0	**216**
1997	106	46	8	3	33	40	35	2	**273**
1998	88	43	5	7	24	33	33	1	**234**
1999	48	26	7	4	23	29	45	4	**186**
2000	45	29	3	0	30	32	35	2	**176**
2001	40	35	10	2	27	31	55	3	**203**
2002	54	32	8	2	29	42	64	4	**235**
2003	58	36	8	1	31	38	58	4	**234**
2004	106	34	20	1	38	37	75	2	**313**
2005	109	26	24	2	51	37	72	1	**322**
2006	77	22	11	4	65	39	93	1	**312**
2007	85	16	6	3	48	25	64	2	**249**
2008	90	25	15	5	45	38	82	1	**301**
2009	62	23	9	4	40	29	84	3	**254**
2010	55	16	8	2	34	45	106	1	**267**
2011	75	19	15	3	49*	32♣	105∞	2≈	**300**
Total	**3,476**	**906**	**189**	**118**	**904**	**1024**	**1486**	**61**	**8,164**

* This figure includes **12** suspensions on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.) but <u>does not</u> include **11** temporary suspensions (Rule 214 Pa.R.D.E.) and **2** temporary suspensions (Rule 208(f) Pa.R.D.E.)

♣ This figure includes **16** disbarments on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.)

∞ This figure includes **91** reinstatements to active status after being inactive three or more years, **11** reinstatements after having been suspended, **1** reinstatement from disability inactive status, and **2** reinstatements after having been disbarred

≈ This figure includes **1** reinstatement denied after having been inactive for three or more years and **1** reinstatement denied after having been disbarred.