

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 2012

Budget

For Fiscal Year 2011-2012, the Board's revenues totaled \$10,074,003 and expenses totaled \$9,560,257. After factoring in the unrealized loss on investments of \$140,060, revenues exceeded expenditures by \$373,686. The Board's invested funds experienced unrealized losses of \$737,052 in 2008-2009 and \$288,119 in 2007-2008 and saw gains of \$1,476,300 in 2009-2010 and \$1,481,533 in 2010-2011, respectively.

On February 9, 2012, the annual Lawyer Assessment Committee telephone conference call took place. At that time, the Board submitted a tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013, which proposed a 4.22% increase in its Budget and projected that expenses would exceed revenues by approximately \$569,240. This Budget was based on an annual fee allocation of \$135.00 per attorney for the Disciplinary Board.

However, by Order dated April 9, 2012, the Supreme Court amended the Rules to provide for a reallocation of the annual fees at \$130.00 per attorney for the Disciplinary Board, \$35.00 per attorney for the PA Lawyers Fund and \$35.00 per attorney for the IOLTA Board. The Order further stated that these reallocations shall only be effective for the 2012-13 assessment and thereafter shall revert to the provisions effective for the 2011-12 assessment year.

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 **62,706** active and **10,400** inactive paid attorneys as of December 31, 2012.

The efficient disposition of complaints is a matter that the Board is continually required to keep under review. During the year 2012, **4,564** new complaints were received by the ODC. **4,495** complaints were disposed of during the year, **298** 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 2012, the Supreme Court ordered the disbarment of **36** attorneys and suspension of **50** attorneys for periods ranging up to five years (this does not include 25 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 2012 year, **32** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board. **20** of those joint petitions were filed prior to scheduled disciplinary hearings. **21** joint petitions were approved and **8** were denied. Of those approved, **6** resulted in private discipline and **15** resulted in public discipline. As of December 31, 2012, **3** of the joint petitions filed in 2012 were not yet final.

Since consent discipline was adopted in Pennsylvania in 2005, **246** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board.

Board Activities

During the year 2012, the Disciplinary Board met five (5) times. All of these meetings combined administrative and executive business. At its executive sessions, the Board adjudicated **36** proceedings involving formal charges. Of the 36 major adjudications, **26** 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 **4** matters. Three-member review panels considered recommendations for summary Private Reprimands in **8** cases and considered **1** appeal by the ODC from a Reviewing Hearing Committee Member determination. **14** respondents appeared before three-member Board panels and received private reprimands and **4** respondents received public reprimands. Finally, **1** Board Member conducted a probation violation hearing and **5** Board Members reviewed petitions 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 2012, Board Members reviewed and approved **79** reinstatements from inactive status, a decrease of **9** 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. Since the one-year grace period expired in September 2010 for delinquent and CLE non-compliant attorneys to petition for reinstatement before they were transferred from involuntary inactive status to administrative suspension, the high volume of petitions reinstatements filed with the Board in 2010 and 2011 have dropped off and are now back to normal levels.

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 2012, the following proposed amendments were approved:

Pa.R.D.E. 219(a), and 502(b) and RPC 1.15(u) – Amended by Order dated April 9, 2012, to be effective for the 2011-2012 assessment year to change the annual fee allocations to provide an annual fee of \$130.00 for the Disciplinary Board, an annual fee of \$35.00 for the PA Lawyers Fund for Client Security, and an annual fee of \$35.00 for the IOLTA Board.

Pa.R.D.E. 216 and 218 - Amended by Order dated March 19, 2012, effective April 18, 2012 to include disability inactive status as a disposition which can be sought as reciprocal discipline from other jurisdictions. The Rules were also amended to include bar associations and disciplinary boards from other jurisdictions as agencies from which reciprocal discipline can be sought.

RPC 1.6 and 1.19 – Amended by Order dated May 17, 2012, effective June 16, 2012 to include ordinances enacted by municipal governing bodies that regulate lawyer/lobbyists.

Pa.R.D.E. 214 and RPC 8.3 – Amended by Order dated March 19, 2012, effective April 18, 2012 to define the term “crime” as an offense that is punishable by imprisonment in the jurisdiction of conviction, whether or not a sentence of imprisonment is actually imposed. It does not include parking violations or summary offenses, both traffic and non-traffic, unless a term of imprisonment is actually imposed. The Comment to RPC 8.3 was amended to put all attorneys on notice of the self-reporting requirements not only relating to the convictions of crimes but also the requirement to self-report when transfers to disability inactive status, suspensions and disbarments are ordered in another jurisdiction.

Pa.R.D.E. 102, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 215 and 402 – Amended by Order dated May 17, 2012, effective June 16, 2012 to create a new type of discipline to be called “public reprimand” which the Board could approve and administer without review or approval by the Supreme Court.

Pa.R.D.E. 204, 205, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219, 401, 502 and 531 and RPC 1.15(u) - Amended by Order dated June 4, 2012, effective July 4, 2012 to make a number of changes relating to the annual registration of attorneys to codify electronic filing of annual fees and implement procedures to request no public access to an attorneys registered address. An additional provision provides for an automatic non-waivable late payment penalty to be assessed on July 31 and a second to be assessed on August 31, the latter provisions will take effect beginning with the 2013-2014 assessment year.

Amendments to Board Rules of Organization and Procedure – Order No. 73 adopted effective August 11, 2012 made conforming amendments consistent with the amendments made to the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 216, 218, 214, 219, 102, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 215 and 402, respectively.

Amendments to Board Rules of Organization and Procedure – Order No. 74 adopted effective November 3, 2012 made conforming amendments consistent with the amendments made to the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 204, 205, 212, 216, 217, 218 and 219, respectively.

Finance & Pension Committee

Effective July 1, 2012, the Disciplinary Board approved some changes to its Pension Plan at the recommendation of the Finance & Pension Committee. There was a change in the allocation date from annual to quarterly deposits to the pension fund; the Board’s contribution was changed to a flat 6% of payroll for all employees instead of one point for each \$100 of salary and 16 points for each year of service; and the minimum 1,000 hours of service requirement for eligibility into the pension plan was eliminated.

The Committee reviewed and approved the proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 and established a two-tiered late payment penalty of \$100 at the time the Final Notices were mailed to attorneys, 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 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, served as the Disciplinary Board's representative on the IAB until his term on the Board expired in August 2012. At that time, Board Member Gerald Lawrence took over as the Board's representative on the IAB. Throughout the year, Board Members Buchholz and Lawrence 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 2012. The topics were "Enhancement Tools for Discipline and Social Media". The first topic included an in-depth discussion about establishing an Ethics School or implementing Diversion Programs directed to attorneys who have engaged in misconduct. The Guest Speakers for this topic were John T. Berry, Director of the Legal Division of the Florida Bar, and Richard L. McCoy, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.

Mr. Berry was extremely knowledgeable about practice and professionalism programs and his insight and suggestions were of great help to the Board. The Board is enthusiastic about delving further into diversion programs in Pennsylvania. The recidivism rate for those attorneys who go through a diversion program is around 8%. 92% of attorneys who went through the Florida diversion program, never received discipline again. These figures definitely make diversion a viable option to letters of concern and educational letters currently being used by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel when dismissing complaints or when imposing informal admonitions for minor first time violations of the Rules. Mr. McCoy was enthusiastic about assisting the Board in identifying courses that are already in place that meet the Board's criteria and in putting together new courses that the Board has identified as areas where attorneys need more education.

The second topic involved social media. Board Member R. Burke McLemore, Jr., led the discussion relating to this topic and distributed several articles and advisory opinions relating to this topic. The use of these newest forms of communication such as social media websites like Facebook and Myspace, Twitter and LinkedIn form the basis for the proposed changes to the Model Rules of Professional Conduct currently under review by the ABA Commission on Ethics 20/20. This topic will be covered in more detail as Pennsylvania considers these amendments in 2013.

The Education Committee also designed the program used at the Training Session & Refresher Course for all Hearing Committee Members held on October 19, 2012 in Hershey. **140** Hearing Committee Members attended the program. The program started with Justice J. Michael Eakin speaking on the role the Supreme Court has in the disciplinary process. Ken Hagreen, Executive Director of Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers and Workers' Compensation Judge Irving L. Bloom, talked about the effect depression and other psychological illnesses had on their ability to practice law and their road to recovery.

The program then broke into two concurrent workshops. New members received information on the disciplinary system, their role in the process, how Hearing Committees are assigned and hearings are scheduled, and a review of the types of discipline and how discipline is determined. At the same time, panels of Senior and Experienced Hearing Committee Members provided tips on chairing hearing committees, presiding at hearings on subpoena issues, conducting prehearing conferences, and issues and questions other members had relating to their duties. Board Members and staff presented most of the program, along with guest speakers Ellen C. Brotman and Samuel C. Stretton, who brought the perspective from respondents' counsel.

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, 2012, there were 63,024 subscribers to the monthly Attorney E-Newsletter, an increase of 5,497 from 2011. In 2012, Suasion redesigned the E-newsletter to improve the availability of quick tips and reminders. A side bar was added in order to include links to forms, FAQs, deadlines for registration and more.

In 2012, Suasion also updated a number of items and Rules on the website at the request of staff. They wrote and distributed press releases and articles concerning online attorney registration and appointments and reappointments to the Disciplinary Board. They drafted and distributed two email blasts to attorneys concerning deadlines for attorney registration and how to do online registration.

In February 2012, Suasion developed an online survey and distributed it to the e-newsletter subscribers. The purpose of the survey was to ensure the Disciplinary Board is continuing to meet its goals and better serve its audiences. Suasion asked for feedback on the Board's electronic communications and the ease of use of the Board's website. The number of individuals who completed the survey was just under 6,000. Suasion compiled the data and provided a report to the Communications Committee and made recommendations to address any issues that arose from the survey.

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 the Fall of 2012, the Board launched a new mobile-friendly website. The new website is now more accessible on various devices, including PCs, smartphones, iPads and more. The information and content has not changed, but how the information appears will be different based on the device being used. The Look Up Attorney section was upgraded to include a "Show/Hide Column" which allows users to choose which specific details they want or don't want to see regarding that attorney. This is especially helpful when trying to access the information on a smaller device, such as a smartphone.

During the 2012 year, **226,044** unique visitors accessed the site, and an average of **596,229** multiple visits by the same computers/visitors accessed the site during the year. The top pages visited were: Look up Attorney, Attorney Home Page, Recent Supreme Court Actions and Online Address Change. 69% of the visits were made from Pennsylvania, with the top five locations being Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Norristown and West Chester.

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 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 or send an email 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, a bank of Supreme Court Opinions and current copies of the Rules.

As of December 31, 2012, there are **150** Hearing Committee Members, consisting of **49** Senior members, **46** Experienced members and **55** New members appointed by the Disciplinary Board who serve on a pro bono basis to conduct hearings.

Other Highlights in 2012

E-Filing with the Supreme Court – On October 1, 2013, the Office of the Secretary of the Board began e-filing Disciplinary Docket 3 cases and attorney reinstatement cases with the Supreme court using the Court's PACFile system. Shortly after that, the Chief Disciplinary Counsel's Office also began e-filing criminal convictions and reciprocal discipline matters. Although there is still some training to do before the staff attorneys in the District Offices can begin e-filing pleadings from their locations, and a few glitches still have to be resolved, the process seems to be progressing well.

Expedited Review by Supreme Court – In April 2012, Chief Disciplinary Counsel began communicating with the Chief Justice in an effort to make minor changes to Court procedures to expedite certain types of cases being filed with the Court. Specifically, requests for reciprocal discipline, disbarments on consent and certificates of admission of disability will be handled on an expedited basis rather than being reviewed under the normal procedures used to review other Disciplinary Board matters.

Public Reprimands – After the Supreme Court approved the amendments to the Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement to make public reprimand a form of discipline, the Board discussed how to make this new discipline public. After some discussion, it was decided that after the public reprimand has been administered to the respondent, the written reprimand will be posted on the Board's website on the Recent Discipline Table as well as in the history of that individual attorney. The reprimand will detail the violations involved in the matter as well as the history of discipline, if any.

District III Office Move – In April 2012, the District III Office moved from its location at 100 Pine Street in Harrisburg to an unused suite in the Pennsylvania Judicial Center. They are now situated in Suite 5800, which is around the corner from the Board's Executive Offices.

Good Cause Requests – After the amendments to Enforcement Rule 219(d) took effect in 2012, Board Member and current Rules Committee Chair, Stephan K. Todd, took on the task of reviewing written requests submitted by attorneys who, for good cause, are asking that their contact information be nonpublic information and not be published on the Board's website or otherwise disclosed. Since that Rule change, he reviewed 10 requests – granting 6 and denying 4.

National Meetings – In February 2012, then Board Chair Sal Cognetti, Jr., Board Members, Stewart L. Cohen and R. Burke McLemore, Board Secretary Elaine Bixler and Assistant Secretary, Marcee Sloan, attended the Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Lawyer Disciplinary Boards (NCLDB) in New Orleans, Louisiana.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Board Members Serving During 2012

Carl D. Buchholz, III, Esq.	Term Expired 8/8/2012
Stewart L. Cohen, Esq.	Served as Chair 4/1/2012 to 4/1/2013
Charlotte S. Jefferies, Esq.	Term Expired 11/3/2012
Gerald Lawrence, Esq.	
David A. Nasatir, Esq.	
Gabriel L. Bevilacqua, Esq.	Served as Vice-Chair 4/1/2012 to 4/1/2013
R. Burke McLemore, Jr., Esq.	
Albert Momjian, Esq.	
Stephan K. Todd, Esq.	
Howell K. Rosenberg, Esq.	
* Patricia M. Hastie	
David W. Schwager, Esq.	
* Douglas W. Leonard	
Jane G. Penny, 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 Admon.	Private Reprimand	Public 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
2012	56	15	9	11	5	50 ¹	36 ²	88 ³	2 ⁴	272
Total	3,532	921	9	200	123	954	1060	1574	63	8,436

¹ This figure includes 12 suspensions on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.) but does not include 16 temporary suspensions (Rule 214 Pa.R.D.E.) and 9 temporary suspensions (Rule 208(f) Pa.R.D.E.)

² This figure includes 22 disbarments on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.)

³ This figure includes 75 reinstatements to active status after being inactive three or more years and 12 reinstatements after having been suspended

⁴ This figure includes 2 reinstatements denied after being disbarred