

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 2010

**Budget**

For Fiscal Year 2009-2010, the Board's revenues totaled \$9,872,848 and expenses totaled \$9,136,791. After factoring in the unrealized gain on investments of \$740,243, revenues exceeded expenditures by \$1,476,300. The Board's invested funds experienced unrealized losses of \$737,052 in 2008-2009, \$288,119 in 2007-2008, \$66,583 in Fiscal Year 2002-2003 and \$501,243 in Fiscal Year 2001-2002 and saw its first gain of \$413,703 in 2003-2004 and gains of \$318,082 in 2004-2005, \$601,650 in 2005-2006, and \$1,080,873 in 2006-2007 respectively.

On February 2, 2010, the annual Lawyer Assessment Committee telephone conference call took place. At that time, the Board submitted a Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011, which proposed a 4.28% increase in its Budget and projected that expenses would exceed revenues by approximately \$394,141. It was determined to recommend to the Supreme Court 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.

At its Meeting in March 2009, the Board took some measures in order to save on expenses. The number of Board Meetings would be reduced from five to four for calendar year 2010, and out of state travel for Board Members would be banned for the balance of the year. That reduction in Meetings will remain in place for 2011, as well. The Board stressed, however, the importance for staff to continue participation in national organizations.

**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 **59,527** active and **10,367** inactive paid attorneys as of December 31, 2009.

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 2010, **4,728** new complaints were received by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. **4,527** complaints were disposed of during the year, **244** 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 2010, the Supreme Court ordered the disbarment of **45** attorneys and suspension of **34** attorneys for periods ranging up to five years (this does not include **14** 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 2010 year, **29** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board. **11** of those joint petitions were filed prior to scheduled disciplinary hearings. **20** joint petitions were approved, **4** were denied, and **2** were withdrawn. Of those approved, **5** resulted in private discipline and **15** resulted in public discipline. As of December 31, 2010, **3** of the joint petitions filed in 2010 were not yet final.

Since consent discipline was adopted in Pennsylvania in 2005, **185** Joint Petitions in Support of Discipline on Consent were filed with the Board.

### **Board Activities**

During the year 2010, the Disciplinary Board met four (4) times. All of these meetings combined administrative and executive business. At its executive sessions, the Board adjudicated **46** proceedings involving formal charges, which is an increase of **14** from the number of proceedings adjudicated in 2009. Of the 46 major adjudications, **39** 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 **9** matters. Three-member review panels considered recommendations for summary Private Reprimands in **10** cases and considered **1** appeal by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel from a Reviewing Hearing Committee Member determination. **16** respondents appeared before three-member Board panels to receive private reprimands. Finally, **1** Board Member conducted a probation violation hearing.

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 Office of Disciplinary Counsel 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.

Due to this change in the Rules, Board Members reviewed and approved **96** reinstatements from inactive status in 2010, an increase of **25** 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.

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 2010, the Board published Notices of Proposed Rulemaking soliciting comments on proposed amendments to the following Rules:

1) Amendment to Rule of Professional Conduct 3.8 (relating to special responsibilities of a prosecutor), published for comment on May 15, 2010, comments due July 2, 2010 – 11 comments were received.

2) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 214 (relating to self-reporting criminal convictions), published for comment on February 27, 2010, comments due April 1, 2010 – no comments were received.

3) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 301 (relating to proceedings where an attorney is declared to be incapacitated or severely mentally disabled), published for comment on September 4, 2010, comments due October 1, 2010 – no comments were received.

4) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 215 (relating to discipline on consent, confidentiality of resignation statements), published for comment on November 6, 2010, comments due December 10, 2010 – six comments were received.

5) Amendment to Rule of Disciplinary Enforcement 203 and Disciplinary Board Rules and Procedures (relating to grounds for discipline and notification to respondent-

attorney of complaint and duty to respond), published for comment on November 27, 2010, comments due December 30, 2010 – four comments were received.

In addition to the above proposed amendments, the following rule changes were approved in 2010:

Pa.R.D.E. 219(d) – Amended effective July 1, 2010 to require that attorneys report on their annual registration form whether they are covered by professional liability insurance on the date of registration in the minimum amount required by Rule of Professional Conduct 1.4(c). The amendments to Rule 219 also provide that the Disciplinary Board will make the information regarding insurance available to the public upon request and on its website. Every attorney who files an annual registration form must notify the Attorney Registration Office in writing of any change in liability insurance coverage within 30 days after the change.

Pa.R.D.E. 521(c) – Amended effective August 28, 2010 to increase the subpoena power of the PA Lawyers Fund, and to establish procedures to challenge the validity of a subpoena issued under those Rules.

Pa.R.D.E. 214 – Amended effective October 31, 2010 to change the self-reporting requirement relating to convictions of serious crimes from 20 days after sentencing to 20 days after the conviction. Conviction is defined as any guilty verdict, whether after trial by judge or jury, or finding of guilt and any plea of guilty of *nolo contendere* that has been accepted by the court, whether or not sentence has been imposed.

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.

At the time of the filing of this annual report, three 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 2010, the Finance & Pension Committee periodically reviewed the performance of the Board's pension funds managed by PNC Advisors. In addition, the

Committee reviewed and approved the proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 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.

KPMG also met with the Finance & Pension Committee and recommended several internal controls be put in place to safeguard against theft of the Board's funds. These measures were put in place during the Spring of 2010.

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 2010. The topics were "Changes in ODC Procedures", "Criminal Conduct Not Related to Practice of Law" and "Public vs. Private Discipline". A number of possible Rule changes were discussed. They ranged from whether all resignation statements resulting in disbarments on consent should be public; requiring that respondents answer DB-7 letters of allegations and whether the failure to do so should be additional grounds for discipline; establishing another form of discipline to be known as a public reprimand; a review of the Rules governing criminal convictions; and whether disbarments in Pennsylvania should be permanent.

The Supreme Court's representative was Justice Thomas Saylor. It was extremely beneficial to have a member of the Court present to participate in the discussion and provide incite on whether the Board should pursue certain changes to the Rules.

The Education Committee also designed the program used at the Training Session and Refresher Course for all Hearing Committee Members held on October 12, 2010 in Hershey. 110 Hearing Committee Members attended the program. The program started with Justice J. Michael Eakin discussing the role of the Supreme Court in the disciplinary process. He was followed by Ken Hagreen, Executive Director of Lawyers Concerned for Lawyers, who discussed the science of addiction and mental health monitoring.

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 speaker Ellen C. Brotman, 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 January 2005, the Board approved the retention of Hershey Philbin Associates (HPA) for consultation services. A sub-committee was formed to meet with HPA monthly, draft an Attorney E-Newsletter, a Hearing Committee E-Newsletter, a new consumer brochure, establish a website for Hearing Committee Members, and to keep HPA apprised of newsworthy events. The Board had a mixed reaction to entering into yearly contracts for HPA's services, and instead, decided they would be retained on a month to month basis to provide support to the Board.

In May 2008, the Board was advised that Victoria Radabaugh had left HPA and was forming her own firm, Suasion, which was focusing on non-profit organization. Ms. Radabaugh was the principal staff person at HPA who worked with the Board on most of its projects. In July 2008, the Board agreed to retain Suasion as its communications firm, and Suasion agreed to bill the Board on an hourly basis rather than on a monthly retainer basis. There was a smooth transition from HPA to Suasion.

In 2010, 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 also contacted many CLE providers, requesting they distribute Disciplinary Board materials to their CLE instructors, printed additional copies of the complaint brochure and added an RSS Feeds section to the Board's website for users to sign up to receive a notice when something has been added to the site.

Suasion also continued to distribute the monthly Attorney E-Newsletter. As of December 31, 2010, there were 48,547 subscribers to the monthly Attorney E-Newsletter, an increase of nearly 4,300 from 2009.

### **Disciplinary Board Website**

On June 25, 2003, the Disciplinary Board launched its Website at [www.padisciplinaryboard.org](http://www.padisciplinaryboard.org). In 2005, the Board purchased two additional domain names ([www.padboard.org](http://www.padboard.org) and [www.padb.us](http://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 new 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 new 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 or from either the Attorney or Consumer section, 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 Discipline Table is on the Board's Home page, and one click on the page 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 2007, 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 2010, Suasion continued to monitor the website which allowed them to compile statistics on the number of visitors to the Board's website. For 2010, **170,531** unique visitors accessed the site, and an average of **508,193** visitors accessed the site daily. The top pages visited were: Look up Attorney, Attorney Home Page and Recent Supreme Court Actions. The website was also updated periodically to add new Rules, update the FAQ sections, and other information.

### **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, 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 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 we experienced in the past.

In June 2007, the Supreme Court approved amending Rule 102, Pa.R.D.E. to lower the criteria by which an experienced hearing committee member would be eligible for promotion to a senior member. The Board requested this change, due to the increasing number of cases where hearings into formal charges were stayed pending resolution of joint petitions for discipline on consent, and the number of joint petitions that were being approved. The Board anticipated there would be a shortage of experienced members who would qualify for senior status when they completed their first three-year term, if the criteria for promotion was not changed. As a result of this change, of the 35 experienced members who were eligible for reappointment to a second term on July 1, 2007, 33 were also eligible for promotion to senior status as opposed to only 15 members who would have been eligible under the prior criteria.

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, the Board has had a number of Board Meetings where no 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, 2010, there are **155** Hearing Committee Members, consisting of **101** Senior members, **26** Experienced members and **28** New members appointed by the Disciplinary Board who serve on a pro bono basis to conduct hearings.

## **Other Highlights in 2010**

Interbranch Commission on Juvenile Justice – In May 2010, the Interbranch Commission on Juvenile Justice issued a report after investigating the juvenile justice scandal in Luzerne County. It noted that “While the tragic events in Luzerne County have drawn criticism nationwide, and rightly so, it is also true that Pennsylvania is an acknowledged leader in the field of juvenile justice. The outstanding commitment of our juvenile court judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation officers, victim advocates and service providers should not be overshadowed by the actions of those who have damaged that reputation.”

The report recommended that the Disciplinary Board create educational materials for the general public and for attorneys, which the Board had already recently done. It also recommended that the Board’s website be redesigned so that it offers a clear and simple mechanism to file complaints against attorneys electronically. This change is in the process of being made.

Reduction in Number of Board Members – In January 2010, the Supreme Court decided to reduce the number of Disciplinary Board Members to 13 by eliminating one of the attorney positions. Pa.R.D.E. 205 was also amended to reflect this change.

Medical Insurance for Retirees – In October 2010, the Board adopted a policy that effective January 1, 2011, employees who retire from the Disciplinary Board will be eligible to participate in the Board’s new Retiree Medical Insurance Program, subject to certain requirements, such as having accrued at least 30 years of retirement service credit and having satisfied the requirements for retirement under the Board’s pension plan.

Online Attorney Registration – In the Fall of 2010, the Board began exploring online registration where attorneys could pay their annual fees using credit cards. The staff is working with the AOPC in implementing this feature and hopes to have everything up and running for the 2011-2012 Fiscal Year. Board Member Gerald Lawrence is serving as the liaison on this project.

National Meetings – In February 2010, Board Members Carl D. Buchholz, III, Sal Cognetti, Jr., Board Secretary Elaine Bixler and Hearing Coordinator, Marcee Sloan, attended the Seventh Annual Meeting of the National Council of Lawyer Disciplinary Boards (NCLDB) in Orlando, Florida.

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Board Members Serving During 2010

William A. Pietragallo, Esq.	Served as Board Chair 4/1/2009 to 4/1/2010
* Marc S. Baer	
Sal Cognito, Jr., Esq.	Served as Vice-Chair 4/1/2010 to 4/6/2011
Carl D. Buchholz, III, Esq.	Served as Chair 4/1/2010 to 4/6/2011
Charlotte S. Jefferies, Esq.	
Stewart L. Cohen, Esq.	
Gerald Lawrence, Jr., Esq.	
David A. Nasatir, Esq.	
Gabriel L. Bevilacqua, Esq.	
* Douglas W. Leonard	Term Expired 4/1/2010
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 (11) members of the Bar of this Commonwealth and two (2) 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.

**THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**Calendar Years**

<b>Calendar Years</b>	<b>Informal Admonition</b>	<b>Private Reprimand</b>	<b>Probation</b>	<b>Public Censure</b>	<b>Suspend</b>	<b>Disbar</b>	<b>Grant Rein.</b>	<b>Deny Rein.</b>	<b>Year-end Totals</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,401</b>	<b>887</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>1381</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>7,864</b>

\* This figure includes **9** suspensions on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.) but does not include **11** temporary suspensions (Rule 214 Pa.R.D.E.) and **3** temporary suspensions (Rule 208(f) Pa.R.D.E.)

♣ This figure includes **26** disbarments on consent (Rule 215 Pa.R.D.E.)

∞ This figure includes **96** reinstatements to active status after being inactive three or more years, **8** reinstatements after having been suspended, **1** reinstatement from disability inactive status, and **1** reinstatement after having been disbarred

≈ This **1** reinstatement denied was after having been inactive for three or more years.