

**Legal Professionalism Committee of the
Commission on the Administration of Law and Justice**

**Presentation by the State Bar
October 6, 2015**

I. Geographic Trends of the Lawyer Population in North Carolina

The lawyer population tends to track the movement of the general population of North Carolina. The lawyer population tends to grow at a faster rate than the population as a whole. However, nine Judicial Districts grew slower than the general population, and four rural Judicial Districts had a net loss of lawyers during the time period of 2004 through 2015 (9A, 27B, 6, 7). Additionally, 15 districts have less than 6 lawyers for every 10,000 residents. The attached charts provide more information regarding the geographic makeup of lawyers in North Carolina.

II. Authorized and Unauthorized Practice of Law

§ 84-2.1. “Practice law” defined:

The phrase “practice law” as used in this Chapter is defined to be performing any legal service for any other person, firm or corporation, with or without compensation, specifically including the preparation or aiding in the preparation of deeds, mortgages, wills, trust instruments, inventories, accounts or reports of guardians, trustees, administrators or executors, or preparing or aiding in the preparation of any petitions or orders in any probate or court proceeding; abstracting or passing upon titles, the preparation and filing of petitions for use in any court, including administrative tribunals and other judicial or quasi-judicial bodies, or assisting by advice, counsel, or otherwise in any legal work; and to advise or give opinion upon the legal rights of any person, firm or corporation: Provided, that the above reference to particular acts which are specifically included within the definition of the phrase “practice law” shall not be construed to limit the foregoing general definition of the term, but shall be construed to include the foregoing particular acts, as well as all other acts within the general definition. The phrase “practice law” does not encompass the drafting or writing of memoranda of understanding or other mediation summaries by mediators at community mediation centers authorized by G.S. 7A-38.5 or by mediators of employment-related matters for The University of North Carolina or a constituent institution, or for an agency, commission, or board of the State of North Carolina.

§ 84-4. Persons other than members of State Bar prohibited from practicing law:

Except as otherwise permitted by law, it shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons, except active members of the Bar of the State of North Carolina admitted and licensed to practice as attorneys-at-law, to appear as attorney or counselor at law in any action or proceeding before any judicial body, including the North Carolina Industrial Commission, or the Utilities Commission; to maintain, conduct, or defend the same, except in his own behalf as a party

thereto; or, by word, sign, letter, or advertisement, to hold out himself, or themselves, as competent or qualified to give legal advice or counsel, or to prepare legal documents, or as being engaged in advising or counseling in law or acting as attorney or counselor-at-law, or in furnishing the services of a lawyer or lawyers; and it shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons except active members of the Bar, for or without a fee or consideration, to give legal advice or counsel, perform for or furnish to another legal services, or to prepare directly or through another for another person, firm or corporation, any will or testamentary disposition, or instrument of trust, or to organize corporations or prepare for another person, firm or corporation, any other legal document. Provided, that nothing herein shall prohibit any person from drawing a will for another in an emergency wherein the imminence of death leaves insufficient time to have the same drawn and its execution supervised by a licensed attorney-at-law. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any other provisions of this Chapter. Provided, however, this section shall not apply to corporations authorized to practice law under the provisions of Chapter 55B of the General Statutes of North Carolina.

Only those licensed to practice in NC are permitted to deliver or offer to deliver legal services.
§ 84-4.

Corporations cannot deliver or offer to deliver legal services, even through the services of lawyers who are licensed in North Carolina. § 84-5

Exceptions to the prohibitions against corporations and unlicensed persons practicing law:

Pro hac vice, § 84-4.1

Public interest law firms, § 84-5.1

Third year practice, § 84-7.1

Emeritus pro bono, 27 NCAC 1A § .0201(c)(1)(B)

In April 2015, HB 436 passed the House, which would have allowed internet-based companies to sell legal document templates to North Carolina consumers and which contained significant consumer-protection requirements. A more liberal committee substitute was approved by the Senate but in September 2015 the House declined to vote on the committee substitute and instead sent the bill to the Judiciary Committee. The bill had strong support from the State Bar, the NC Bar Association and LegalZoom but was strenuously opposed by the NCBA Real Property Section and by RELANC. The bill could be resuscitated next year. Thus, the law remains that a corporation cannot practice law in North Carolina other than the exceptions set forth above.

III. Business Entities in Which Lawyers May Practice

Lawyers may practice law only in business entities that are solely owned by lawyers. *See* Rule 5.4. By law and State Bar rule, this means that lawyers may practice in the following types of business organizations: sole proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability partnerships, professional corporations (a/k/a professional associations), and professional limited liability companies. Professional corporations and professional limited liability companies formed for the practice of law are required to register with the State Bar (see Chapters 55B and 57D of the

General Statutes). Ownership of law firms is limited to lawyers as a matter of law (see G.S. §84-5) and professional responsibility on the assumption that lawyers can only exercise independent professional judgment on behalf of their clients if the ownership and management of their law firms is limited to lawyers. Washington DC is the only jurisdiction that allows some non-lawyer ownership of law firms.

IV. Pro Bono

Mandatory pro bono would doubtless make more legal services available to more people to whom they are currently out of reach but raises a host of other issues including, but not limited to, the question of whether mandating representation will result in mediocre (or worse) legal representation. Nevertheless, courts have almost universally concluded that mandatory pro bono does not implicate the Fifth and Thirteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. See *United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situated in Klickitat County*, 795 F.2d 796 (9th Cir. 1986); *Lawyers Do it For Free?: An Examination of Mandatory Pro Bono*, 29 Tex. Tech L. Rev. 1141 Texas Tech Law Review (1998).

The State Bar has taken steps to encourage and facilitate pro bono without mandating it. In 2010, it adopted Rule 6.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct which includes the goal of 50 hours of voluntary pro bono for every active member of the State Bar. Since lawyers are not required to report hours of pro bono service, the State Bar does not know how effective Rule 6.1 has been in motivating lawyers to provide legal representation to the indigent.

In an effort to expand the number of lawyers volunteering to work for legal services organizations, the State Bar created two membership statuses that allow lawyers who would not otherwise be authorized to practice law to “represent indigent persons under the supervision of active members [of the State Bar] who are employed by nonprofit corporations duly authorized to provide legal services to such persons.” The rules allow inactive members of the State Bar to petition for “emeritus pro bono status.” See 27 N.C.A.C. 1A, § .0201(c)(1)(B). These lawyers can provide legal representation under the supervision of a legal aid lawyer without losing the benefits of inactive status (no State Bar dues and no CLE requirements). Similarly, the State Bar’s “Pro Bono Practice by Out of State Lawyers” rule allows lawyers who are licensed in another jurisdiction, but not North Carolina, to practice in North Carolina under the supervision of a legal aid lawyer. See 27 N.C.A.C. 1D, § .0905.

V. Young Lawyers

The State Bar collects no special statistics on young lawyers. It does not keep records of the student debt of new lawyers except as that information may be contained in individual bar application files that are transferred by the Board of Law Examiners to the State Bar when lawyers pass the bar exam and become members of the State Bar.

The State Bar also does not keep demographic information on respondents in grievance files. Therefore, the State Bar does not have statistics that support the common assumption that young lawyers are disproportionately likely to engage in professional misconduct. However, in preparation for this presentation, 2014 grievances were analyzed by the respondents’ years of

licensure on the assumption that more recent licensees would be predominantly young lawyers. The analysis does not support the assumption that young lawyers are more likely to engage in misconduct.

Recently, a mandatory mentoring program for new lawyers was considered by a State Bar committee. After study, the committee concluded that requiring lawyers to participate in a “mentoring relationship”—either as mentors or as protégés—was contrary to the premise of mentoring and that establishing voluntary mentoring relationships is best left to the voluntary bar.

The State Bar has one program that is specific to new lawyers. During the first year that a lawyer is required to attend CLE, the lawyer must take a 12.0 CLE credit hour course called “Professionalism for New Attorneys.” Here is the description in Rule .1518 of the CLE Rules of the State Bar:

Content and Accreditation. The State Bar PNA Program shall consist of 12 hours of training in subjects designated by the State Bar including, but not limited to, professional responsibility, professionalism, and law office management. The chairs of the Ethics and Grievance Committees, in consultation with the chief counsel to those committees, shall annually establish the content of the program and shall publish the required content on or before January 1 of each year. To be approved as a PNA Program, a sponsor must satisfy the annual content requirements. At least 45 days prior to the presentation of a PNA Program, a sponsor must submit a detailed description of the program to the board for approval. Accredited sponsors shall not be exempt from the prior submission requirement and may not advertise a PNA Program until approved by the board. PNA Programs shall be specially designated by the board and no course that is not so designated shall satisfy the PNA Program requirement for new members.

27 N.C.A.C. 1D, §.1518(c)(1).

VI. Paralegal Certification and Limited License Legal Technicians

The State Bar has been issuing paralegal certifications since 2005. This is a voluntary program in which applicants must demonstrate that they have obtained a degree or certificate in paralegal studies from a qualified institution and must pass a three hour exam. *See* 27 N.C.A.C. 1G. Work experience as a paralegal is not required for certification. The purpose of the program is not to identify paralegals who can provide legal services to members of the public but rather to identify qualified paralegals for employment by lawyers. Once certified, a certified paralegal (CP) must maintain competency by taking 6.0 hours of mandatory continuing paralegal education every year. The program improves lawyer competency by improving the quality of the assistants to whom the lawyer delegates work. Whether lawyers charge clients more for work performed by a CP than for work performed by a paralegal or legal assistant who is not certified is unknown.

The paralegal certification program is overseen by the Board of Paralegal Certification which is appointed by the State Bar Council. In 2013, the officers of the State Bar asked the board to monitor the Limited License Legal Technician (LLLT) program initiated by the Washington State Supreme Court in 2012 to make a recommendation to the State Bar Council on whether the North Carolina State Bar should adopt a similar program. Washington's LLLT program trains and licenses non-lawyer "technicians" to provide specified and limited legal services directly to members of the public (not under the supervision of a lawyer) with the desired outcome being more accessible and less expensive basic legal services in such practice areas as family law, real estate and wills. When adopting the rule for the LLLT program, the Washington Supreme Court stated that the program was part of a "narrowly tailored strategy designed to expand the provision of legal and law related services to members of the public in need of individualized legal assistance with non-complex legal problems." Here is a link to the website for the program: <http://www.wsba.org/licensing-and-lawyer-conduct/limited-licenses/legal-technicians>.

The Board of Paralegal Certification has yet to make a recommendation to the Council. It is waiting to see whether the first class of LLLTs, who were recently licensed to provide limited legal services in the area of family law, in fact provide reduced-cost legal services to the public or, there being no restrictions on what they can charge for their services, charge comparable fees to those charged by lawyers either while working in a law firm or starting their own limited law practice.

VII. Technology

The State Bar does not currently have a program or policy in place to facilitate the use of technology to improve the delivery legal services. However, the State Bar has adopted a number of ethics rules and ethics opinions that support the use of technology by lawyers. For example, formal ethics opinion 2008 FEO 5 allows lawyers to store client confidential information "in the cloud" on the internet provided the lawyer makes reasonable efforts to prevent unauthorized or inadvertent disclosure or unauthorized access to confidential client information. There are a few ethics opinions written specifically in response to questions from lawyers interested in establishing virtual law firms. See, e.g., 2005 FEO 10, *Virtual Law Practice and Unbundled Legal Services*. These opinions do not place impediments in the way of forming a virtual law firm; however, there is nothing to indicate that the number virtual law firms is increasing substantially.

NC Rules of Professional Conduct

Rule 6.1 Voluntary Pro Bono Public Service

Every lawyer has a professional responsibility to provide legal services to those unable to pay. A lawyer should aspire to render at least (50) hours of pro bono publico legal services per year. In fulfilling this responsibility, the lawyer should:

(a) provide a substantial majority of the (50) hours of legal services without fee or expectation of fee to:

- (1) persons of limited means;
- (2) charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations in matters that are designed primarily to address the needs of persons of limited means; or
- (3) individuals, groups or organizations seeking to secure or protect civil rights, civil liberties or public rights, or charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations in matters in furtherance of their organizational purposes, where the payment of standard legal fees would significantly deplete the organization's economic resources or would be otherwise inappropriate

(b) provide any additional services through:

- (1) the delivery of legal services described in paragraph (a) at a substantially reduced fee; or
- (2) participation in activities for improving the law, the legal system or the legal profession.

In addition, a lawyer should voluntarily contribute financial support to organizations that provide legal services to persons of limited means.

Comment

[1] Every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional work load, has a responsibility to provide legal services to those unable to pay, and personal involvement in the problems of the disadvantaged can be one of the most rewarding experiences in the life of a lawyer. The North Carolina State Bar urges all lawyers to provide a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono services annually. It is recognized that in some years a lawyer may render greater or fewer hours than the annual standard specified, but during the course of his or her legal career, each lawyer should render on average per year the number of hours set forth in this Rule. Services can be performed in civil matters or in criminal or quasi-criminal matters for which there is no government obligation to provide funds for legal representation, such as post-conviction death penalty appeal cases.

[2] The critical need for legal services among persons of limited means is recognized in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of the Rule. Legal services to persons of limited means consists of a full range of activities, including individual and class representation, the provision of legal advice, legislative lobbying, administrative rule making and the provision of free training or mentoring to those who represent persons of limited means. The variety of these activities should facilitate participation by government lawyers, even when restrictions exist on their engaging in the outside practice of law.

[3] Persons eligible for legal services under paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) are those who qualify for participation in programs funded by the Legal Services Corporation and those whose incomes and financial resources are slightly above the guidelines utilized by such programs but, nevertheless, cannot afford counsel. Legal services can be rendered to individuals or to organizations such as homeless shelters, battered women's centers and food pantries that serve those of limited means. The term "governmental organizations" includes, but is not limited to, public protection programs and sections of governmental or public sector agencies.

[4] Because service must be provided without fee or expectation of fee, the intent of the lawyer to render free legal services is essential for the work performed to fall within the meaning of paragraph (a). Accordingly, services rendered cannot be considered pro bono if an anticipated fee is uncollected, but the award of statutory attorneys' fees in a case originally accepted as pro bono would not disqualify such services from inclusion under this section. Lawyers who do receive fees in such cases are encouraged to contribute an appropriate portion of such fees to organizations described in paragraphs (a)(2) and (3).

[5] Constitutional, statutory or regulatory restrictions may prohibit or impede government and public sector lawyers and judges from performing the pro bono services outlined in paragraphs (a)(1), (2), and (3), and (b) (1). Accordingly, where those restrictions apply, government and public sector lawyers and judges may fulfill their pro bono responsibility by performing services outlined in paragraph (b)(2). Such lawyers and judges are not expected to undertake the reporting outlined in paragraph twelve of this Comment.

[6] Paragraph (a)(3) includes the provision of certain types of legal services to those whose incomes and financial resources place them above limited means. Examples of the types of issues that may be addressed under this paragraph include First Amendment claims, Title VII claims and environmental protection claims. Additionally, a wide range of organizations may be represented, including social service, medical research, cultural and religious groups.

[7] Paragraph (b)(1) covers instances in which lawyers agree to and receive a modest fee for furnishing legal services to persons of limited means. Participation in judicare programs and acceptance of court appointments in which the fee is substantially below a lawyer's usual rate are encouraged under this section.

[8] Paragraph (b)(2) recognizes the value of lawyers engaging in activities that improve the law, the legal system or the legal profession. Serving on bar association committees; serving on boards of pro bono or legal services programs; taking part in Law Day activities; acting as a continuing legal education instructor, a mediator or an arbitrator; and engaging in legislative lobbying to improve the law, the legal system or the profession are a few examples of the many activities that fall within this paragraph.

[9] Because the efforts of individual lawyers are not enough to meet the need for free legal services that exists among persons of limited means, the government and the profession have instituted additional programs to provide those services. Every lawyer should financially support such programs, in addition to either providing direct pro bono services or making financial contributions when pro bono service is not feasible.

[10] Law firms should act reasonably to enable and encourage all lawyers in the firm to provide the pro bono legal services called for by this Rule.

[11] The responsibility set forth in this Rule is not intended to be enforced through disciplinary process.

[12] Lawyers are encouraged to report pro bono legal services to Legal Aid of North Carolina, the North Carolina Equal Access to Justice Commission, or other similar agency as appropriate in order that such service might be recognized and serve as an inspiration to others.

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Gates	1	2	11,947	5974	1.7	346	0.006	173.00
Camden	1	2	10,239	5120	2.0	306	0.007	153.00
Greene	8	6	21,283	3547	2.8	266	0.023	44.33
Washington	2	4	12,682	3171	3.2	424	0.009	106.00
Montgomery	19B	11	27,819	2529	4.0	502	0.022	45.64
Hoke	16A	23	50,987	2217	4.5	392	0.059	17.04
Duplin	4	29	60,126	2073	4.8	819	0.035	28.24
Tyrrell	2	2	4,135	2068	4.8	600	0.003	300.00
Bertie	6	10	20,621	2062	4.8	741	0.013	74.10
Northampton	6	11	21,218	1929	5.2	551	0.020	50.09
Stokes	17B	26	46,786	1799	5.6	456	0.057	17.54
Graham	30	5	8,840	1768	5.7	302	0.017	60.40
Caldwell	25	48	82,447	1718	5.8	474	0.101	9.88
Warren	9	12	20,524	1710	5.8	444	0.027	37.00
Perquimans	1	8	13,627	1703	5.9	329	0.024	41.13
Martin	2	15	23,714	1581	6.3	461	0.033	30.73
Sampson	4	42	64,400	1533	6.5	947	0.044	22.55
Alexander	22A	25	37,829	1513	6.6	263	0.095	10.52
Jones	4	7	10,470	1496	6.7	473	0.015	67.57
Caswell	9A	16	23,606	1475	6.8	428	0.037	26.75
Currituck	1	17	24,958	1468	6.8	526	0.032	30.94
Yadkin	23	26	37,846	1456	6.9	337	0.077	12.96
Hyde	2	4	5,743	1436	7.0	1424	0.003	356.00
Randolph	19B	103	143,079	1389	7.2	790	0.130	7.67
Franklin	9	47	63,217	1345	7.4	495	0.095	10.53
McDowell	29A	34	45,320	1333	7.5	446	0.076	13.12
Pender	5	43	56,540	1315	7.6	933	0.046	21.70
Lincoln	27B	61	80,202	1315	7.6	307	0.199	5.03
Madison	24	17	21,584	1270	7.9	452	0.038	26.59
Halifax	6	42	53,189	1266	7.9	731	0.057	17.40

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Rutherford	29A	54	67,600	1252	8.0	566	0.095	10.48
Rockingham	17A	74	92,557	1251	8.0	572	0.129	7.73
Onslow	4	155	193,221	1247	8.0	909	0.171	5.86
Mitchell	24	13	15,830	1218	8.2	222	0.059	17.08
Bladen	13	29	35,113	1211	8.3	887	0.033	30.59
Anson	16C	22	26,464	1203	8.3	537	0.041	24.41
Scotland	16A	30	36,059	1202	8.3	321	0.093	10.70
Robeson	16B	112	133,562	1193	8.4	951	0.118	8.49
Harnett	11A	106	125,717	1186	8.4	601	0.176	5.67
Davidson	22B	139	164,464	1183	8.5	567	0.245	4.08
Stanly	20A	52	61,061	1174	8.5	404	0.129	7.77
Burke	25	77	89,198	1158	8.6	515	0.150	6.69
Vance	9	39	45,078	1156	8.7	270	0.144	6.92
Person	9A	34	39,268	1155	8.7	404	0.084	11.88
Cleveland	27B	86	97,910	1138	8.8	469	0.183	5.45
Ashe	23	25	27,448	1098	9.1	427	0.059	17.08
Pamlico	3B	12	13,137	1095	9.1	566	0.021	47.17
Wayne	8	115	125,689	1093	9.1	557	0.206	4.84
Wilkes	23	65	69,890	1075	9.3	760	0.086	11.69
Union	20B	204	215,956	1059	9.4	640	0.319	3.14
Johnston	11B	175	180,050	1029	9.7	796	0.220	4.55
Granville	9	57	58,102	1019	9.8	537	0.106	9.42
Alleghany	23	11	11,111	1010	9.9	236	0.047	21.45
Yancey	24	18	17,915	995	10.0	313	0.058	17.39
Edgecombe	7	56	55,474	991	10.1	507	0.110	9.05
Chowan	1	15	14,637	976	10.2	233	0.064	15.53
Surry	17B	76	73,840	972	10.3	538	0.141	7.08
Richmond	16C	47	45,543	969	10.3	480	0.098	10.21
Cabarrus	19A	202	191,080	946	10.6	365	0.553	1.81
Cherokee	30	29	27,360	943	10.6	497	0.058	17.14

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Transylvania	29B	36	33,440	929	10.8	381	0.094	10.58
Columbus	13	63	57,645	915	10.9	954	0.066	15.14
Brunswick	13	129	117,852	914	10.9	1050	0.123	8.14
Rowan	19C	152	138,709	913	11.0	524	0.290	3.45
Macon	30	38	34,432	906	11.0	519	0.073	13.66
Polk	29B	23	20,755	902	11.1	239	0.096	10.39
Hertford	6	28	24,595	878	11.4	360	0.078	12.86
Lee	11A	69	59,205	858	11.7	259	0.266	3.75
Lenoir	8	70	58,826	840	11.9	402	0.174	5.74
Cumberland	12	397	329,411	830	12.1	658	0.603	1.66
Clay	30	13	10,750	827	12.1	221	0.059	17.00
Beaufort	2	58	47,714	823	12.2	959	0.060	16.53
Catawba	25	192	155,832	812	12.3	414	0.464	2.16
Henderson	29B	138	110,903	804	12.4	375	0.368	2.72
Davie	22B	52	41,474	798	12.5	267	0.195	5.13
Chatham	15B	87	68,726	790	12.7	709	0.123	8.15
Wilson	7	104	81,405	783	12.8	374	0.278	3.60
Nash	7	124	94,528	762	13.1	543	0.228	4.38
Alamance	15A	208	155,788	749	13.4	435	0.478	2.09
Avery	24	24	17,895	746	13.4	247	0.097	10.29
Swain	30	20	14,829	741	13.5	541	0.037	27.05
Jackson	30	57	41,032	720	13.9	494	0.115	8.67
Gaston	27A	293	210,745	719	13.9	364	0.805	1.24
Iredell	22A	233	167,161	717	13.9	597	0.390	2.56
Haywood	30	86	59,913	697	14.4	555	0.155	6.45
Moore	19D	149	93,079	625	16.0	706	0.211	4.74
Pitt	3A	280	174,414	623	16.1	655	0.427	2.34
Watauga	24	87	52,923	608	16.4	313	0.278	3.60
Pasquotank	1	68	39,655	583	17.1	289	0.235	4.25

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Alamance	15A	208	155,788	749	13.4	435	0.478	2.09
Alexander	22A	25	37,829	1513	6.6	263	0.095	10.52
Alleghany	23	11	11,111	1010	9.9	236	0.047	21.45
Anson	16C	22	26,464	1203	8.3	537	0.041	24.41
Ashe	23	25	27,448	1098	9.1	427	0.059	17.08
Avery	24	24	17,895	746	13.4	247	0.097	10.29
Beaufort	2	58	47,714	823	12.2	959	0.060	16.53
Bertie	6	10	20,621	2062	4.8	741	0.013	74.10
Bladen	13	29	35,113	1211	8.3	887	0.033	30.59
Brunswick	13	129	117,852	914	10.9	1050	0.123	8.14
Buncombe	28	757	251,271	332	30.1	660	1.147	0.87
Burke	25	77	89,198	1158	8.6	515	0.150	6.69
Cabarrus	19A	202	191,080	946	10.6	365	0.553	1.81
Caldwell	25	48	82,447	1718	5.8	474	0.101	9.88
Camden	1	2	10,239	5120	2.0	306	0.007	153.00
Carteret	3B	122	69,358	569	17.6	1341	0.091	10.99
Caswell	9A	16	23,606	1475	6.8	428	0.037	26.75
Catawba	25	192	155,832	812	12.3	414	0.464	2.16
Chatham	15B	87	68,726	790	12.7	709	0.123	8.15
Cherokee	30	29	27,360	943	10.6	497	0.058	17.14
Chowan	1	15	14,637	976	10.2	233	0.064	15.53
Clay	30	13	10,750	827	12.1	221	0.059	17.00
Cleveland	27B	86	97,910	1138	8.8	469	0.183	5.45
Columbus	13	63	57,645	915	10.9	954	0.066	15.14
Craven	3B	184	104,513	568	17.6	774	0.238	4.21
Cumberland	12	397	329,411	830	12.1	658	0.603	1.66
Currituck	1	17	24,958	1468	6.8	526	0.032	30.94
Dare	1	80	35,373	442	22.6	1562	0.051	19.53
Davidson	22B	139	164,464	1183	8.5	567	0.245	4.08
Davie	22B	52	41,474	798	12.5	267	0.195	5.13

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Duplin	4	29	60,126	2073	4.8	819	0.035	28.24
Durham	14	1,406	292,194	208	48.1	298	4.718	0.21
Edgecombe	7	56	55,474	991	10.1	507	0.110	9.05
Forsyth	21	1,258	364,258	290	34.5	413	3.046	0.33
Franklin	9	47	63,217	1345	7.4	495	0.095	10.53
Gaston	27A	293	210,745	719	13.9	364	0.805	1.24
Gates	1	2	11,947	5974	1.7	346	0.006	173.00
Graham	30	5	8,840	1768	5.7	302	0.017	60.40
Granville	9	57	58,102	1019	9.8	537	0.106	9.42
Greene	8	6	21,283	3547	2.8	266	0.023	44.33
Guilford	18/18H	1,519	512,281	337	29.7	658	2.309	0.43
Halifax	6	42	53,189	1266	7.9	731	0.057	17.40
Harnett	11A	106	125,717	1186	8.4	601	0.176	5.67
Haywood	30	86	59,913	697	14.4	555	0.155	6.45
Henderson	29B	138	110,903	804	12.4	375	0.368	2.72
Hertford	6	28	24,595	878	11.4	360	0.078	12.86
Hoke	16A	23	50,987	2217	4.5	392	0.059	17.04
Hyde	2	4	5,743	1436	7.0	1424	0.003	356.00
Iredell	22A	233	167,161	717	13.9	597	0.390	2.56
Jackson	30	57	41,032	720	13.9	494	0.115	8.67
Johnston	11B	175	180,050	1029	9.7	796	0.220	4.55
Jones	4	7	10,470	1496	6.7	473	0.015	67.57
Lee	11A	69	59,205	858	11.7	259	0.266	3.75
Lenoir	8	70	58,826	840	11.9	402	0.174	5.74
Lincoln	27B	61	80,202	1315	7.6	307	0.199	5.03
Macon	30	38	34,432	906	11.0	519	0.073	13.66
Madison	24	17	21,584	1270	7.9	452	0.038	26.59
Martin	2	15	23,714	1581	6.3	461	0.033	30.73
McDowell	29A	34	45,320	1333	7.5	446	0.076	13.12
Mecklenburg	26	5,174	1,013,290	196	51.1	546	9.476	0.11

Active Lawyers by County as of 10/5/2015

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

County	Judicial District	Active Lawyers	Population Estimate for July 2014	Residents per Lawyer	Lawyers per 10,000 residents	Area (sq mi)	Lawyers per sq mi	Sq mi per Lawyer
Mitchell	24	13	15,830	1218	8.2	222	0.059	17.08
Montgomery	19B	11	27,819	2529	4.0	502	0.022	45.64
Moore	19D	149	93,079	625	16.0	706	0.211	4.74
Nash	7	124	94,528	762	13.1	543	0.228	4.38
New Hanover	5	760	216,951	285	35.0	328	2.317	0.43
Northampton	6	11	21,218	1929	5.2	551	0.020	50.09
Onslow	4	155	193,221	1247	8.0	909	0.171	5.86
Orange	15B	807	139,930	173	57.7	401	2.012	0.50
Pamlico	3B	12	13,137	1095	9.1	566	0.021	47.17
Pasquotank	1	68	39,655	583	17.1	289	0.235	4.25
Pender	5	43	56,540	1315	7.6	933	0.046	21.70
Perquimans	1	8	13,627	1703	5.9	329	0.024	41.13
Person	9A	34	39,268	1155	8.7	404	0.084	11.88
Pitt	3A	280	174,414	623	16.1	655	0.427	2.34
Polk	29B	23	20,755	902	11.1	239	0.096	10.39
Randolph	19B	103	143,079	1389	7.2	790	0.130	7.67
Richmond	16C	47	45,543	969	10.3	480	0.098	10.21
Robeson	16B	112	133,562	1193	8.4	951	0.118	8.49
Rockingham	17A	74	92,557	1251	8.0	572	0.129	7.73
Rowan	19C	152	138,709	913	11.0	524	0.290	3.45
Rutherford	29A	54	67,600	1252	8.0	566	0.095	10.48
Sampson	4	42	64,400	1533	6.5	947	0.044	22.55
Scotland	16A	30	36,059	1202	8.3	321	0.093	10.70
Stanly	20A	52	61,061	1174	8.5	404	0.129	7.77
Stokes	17B	26	46,786	1799	5.6	456	0.057	17.54
Surry	17B	76	73,840	972	10.3	538	0.141	7.08
Swain	30	20	14,829	741	13.5	541	0.037	27.05
Transylvania	29B	36	33,440	929	10.8	381	0.094	10.58
Tyrrell	2	2	4,135	2068	4.8	600	0.003	300.00

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
9A	Caswell Person	45	44 (-2.3%)	28 (-57.1%)	(-60.7%)	60,750	63,121 (3.8%)	62,874 (-0.4%)	3.4%	(-64.1%)
27B	Cleveland Lincoln	110	121 (9.1%)	86 (-40.7%)	(-27.9%)	164,773	176,456 (6.6%)	178,112 (0.9%)	7.5%	(-35.4%)
6	Bertie Halifax Hertford Northampton	114	95 (-20.0%)	91 (-4.4%)	(-25.3%)	121,545	122,518 (0.8%)	119,623 (-2.4%)	(-1.6%)	(-23.7%)
16A	Hoke Scotland	52	51 (-2.0%)	53 (3.8%)	1.9%	74,193	83,663 (11.3%)	87,046 (3.9%)	14.8%	(-12.9%)
11B	Johnston	149	162 (8.0%)	175 (7.4%)	14.9%	139,658	169,612 (17.7%)	180,050 (5.8%)	22.4%	(-7.6%)
7	Edgecombe Nash Wilson	291	290 (-0.3%)	284 (-2.1%)	(-2.5%)	221,425	233,819 (5.3%)	231,407 (-1.0%)	4.3%	(-6.8%)
3A	Pitt	242	266 (9.0%)	280 (5.0%)	13.6%	144,233	168,827 (14.6%)	174,414 (3.2%)	17.3%	(-3.7%)
11A	Harnett Lee	149	161 (7.5%)	175 (8.0%)	14.9%	150,764	173,603 (13.2%)	184,922 (6.1%)	18.5%	(-3.6%)
25	Burke Caldwell Catawba	304	329 (7.6%)	317 (-3.8%)	4.1%	313,680	328,045 (4.4%)	327,477 (-0.2%)	4.2%	(-0.1%)
2	Beaufort Hyde Martin Tyrrell Washington	82	81 (-1.2%)	83 (2.4%)	1.2%	93,627	95,577 (2.0%)	93,988 (-1.7%)	0.4%	+0.8%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
21	Forsyth	1080	1158 (6.7%)	1258 (7.9%)	14.1%	319,220	351,394 (9.2%)	364,258 (3.5%)	12.4%	+1.8%
19D	Moore	118	138 (14.5%)	143 (3.5%)	17.5%	79,159	88,554 (10.6%)	93,079 (4.9%)	15.0%	+2.5%
19A	Cabarrus	137	166 (17.5%)	186 (10.8%)	26.3%	146,053	178,690 (18.3%)	191,080 (6.5%)	23.6%	+2.8%
15A	Alamance	166	174 (4.6%)	195 (10.8%)	14.9%	137,027	151,550 (9.6%)	155,788 (2.7%)	12.0%	+2.8%
3B	Carteret Craven Pamlico	277	306 (9.5%)	318 (3.8%)	12.9%	169,136	184,000 (8.1%)	187,008 (1.6%)	9.6%	+3.3%
8	Greene Lenoir Wayne	175	184 (4.9%)	191 (3.7%)	8.4%	195,606	203,553 (3.9%)	205,798 (1.1%)	5.0%	+3.4%
18/18H	Guilford	1220	1391 (12.3%)	1519 (8.4%)	19.7%	436,845	489,479 (10.8%)	512,281 (4.5%)	14.7%	+5.0%
22B	Davidson Davie	-	180	191 (5.8%)	5.8%	190,153	204,220 (6.9%)	205,938 (0.8%)	7.7%	+5.0%
9	Franklin Granville Vance Warren	133	147 (9.5%)	155 (5.2%)	14.2%	170,821	184,666 (7.5%)	186,921 (1.2%)	8.6%	+5.6%
4	Duplin Jones Onslow Sampson	186	212 (12.3%)	233 (9.0%)	20.2%	285,313	319,187 (10.6%)	328,217 (2.8%)	13.1%	+7.1%
10	Wake	3524	4528 (22.2%)	5444 (16.8%)	35.3%	721,246	906,910 (20.5%)	985,320 (8.0%)	26.8%	+8.5%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
13	Bladen Brunswick Columbus	162	198 (18.2%)	221 (10.4%)	26.7%	172,759	201,213 (14.1%)	210,610 (4.5%)	18.0%	+8.7%
24	Avery Madison Mitchell Watauga Yancey	132	153 (13.7%)	159 (3.8)	17.0%	116,285	122,858 (5.4%)	126,147 (2.6%)	7.8%	+9.2%
20A	Stanly	-	45	50 (10.0%)	10.0%	58,640	60,567 (3.2%)	61,061 (0.8%)	4.0%	+9.2%
19B	Montgomery Randolph	96	109 (11.9%)	114 (4.4%)	15.8%	161,132	169,904 (5.2%)	170,898 (0.6%)	5.7%	+10.1%
29A	McDowell Rutherford	-	85	95 (10.5%)	10.5%	107,284	112,844 (4.9%)	112,920 (0.1%)	5.0%	+10.4%
12	Cumberland	323	381 (15.2%)	390 (2.3%)	17.2%	307,837	327,435 (6.0%)	329,411 (0.6%)	6.5%	+10.6%
23	Alleghany Ashe Wilkes Yadkin	107	121 (11.6%)	127 (4.7%)	15.7%	140,174	146,044 (4.0%)	146,295 (0.2%)	4.2%	+11.6%
17A	Rockingham	66	73 (9.6%)	75 (2.7%)	12.0%	92,197	93,604 (1.5%)	92,557 (-1.1%)	0.4%	+11.6%
17B	Stokes Surry	87	90 (3.3%)	102 (11.8%)	14.7%	117,488	121,054 (2.9%)	120,626 (-0.4%)	2.6%	+12.1%
14	Durham	966	1141 (15.3%)	1406 (18.8%)	31.3%	237,571	271,303 (12.4%)	292,194 (7.1%)	18.7%	+12.6%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
1	Camden Chowan Currituck Dare Gates Pasquotank Perquimans	152	183 (16.9%)	192 (4.7%)	20.8%	138,495	148,663 (6.8%)	150,436 (1.2%)	7.9%	+12.9%
5	New Hanover Pender	545	702 (22.4%)	803 (12.6%)	32.1%	221,971	255,734 (13.2%)	273,491 (6.5%)	18.8%	+13.3%
29B	Henderson Polk Transylvania	-	180	215 (16.3%)	16.3%	145,322	160,429 (9.4%)	165,098 (2.8%)	12.0%	+13.5%
26	Mecklenburg	3247	4233 (23.3%)	5174 (18.2%)	37.2%	774,020	923,417 (16.2%)	1,013,290 (8.9%)	23.6%	+13.6%
16C	Anson Richmond	-	61	69 (11.6%)	11.6%	72,199	73,491 (1.8%)	72,007 (-2.1%)	(-0.3%)	+13.7%
19C	Rowan	116	132 (12.1%)	146 (9.6%)	20.5%	131,247	138,342 (5.1%)	138,709 (0.3%)	5.4%	+15.2%
16B	Robeson	88	102 (13.7%)	111 (8.1%)	20.7%	126,306	134,438 (6.0%)	133,562 (-0.7%)	5.4%	+15.3%
15B	Chatham Orange	616	770 (20.0%)	894 (13.9%)	31.1%	175,903	197,839 (11.1%)	208,656 (5.2%)	15.7%	+15.4%
30	Cherokee Clay Graham Haywood Jackson Macon Swain	189	244 (22.5%)	248 (1.6%)	23.8%	181,217	194,085 (6.6%)	197,156 (1.6%)	8.1%	+15.7%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
22A	Alexander Iredell	-	206	258 (20.2%)	20.2%	170,693	197,100 (13.4%)	204,990 (3.8%)	16.7%	+16.4%
28	Buncombe	513	609 (15.8%)	740 (17.7%)	30.7%	217,323	238,857 (9.0%)	251,271 (4.9%)	13.5%	+17.2%
27A	Gaston	194	229 (15.3%)	284 (19.4%)	31.7%	190,038	206,081 (7.8%)	21,0745 (2.2%)	9.8%	+21.9%
20B	Union	-	136	204 (33.3%)	33.3%	151,102	202,171 (25.3%)	215,956 (6.4%)	30.0%	+26.9%
	North Carolina*		20,181	23,739 (15.0%)		8,542,430	9,426,254 (9.4%)	9,953,687 (5.3%)	14.2%	
	Average		459	540 (15.0%)			219,215 (8.8%)	226,220 (2.4%)	10.9%	+4.7%
	Median		170	192 (11.5%)			178,690 (7.6%)	185,921 (1.9%)	9.1%	+8.9%

*23,616 Lawyers active and residing in North Carolina (There are 28,009 total active lawyers with a North Carolina law license). Population estimates are from the North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management. For districts without 2004 data, total percentage change of the lawyer population was calculated for 2010-15 and compared with district population change from 2010-2014.

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
1	Camden Chowan Currituck Dare Gates Pasquotank Perquimans	152	183 (16.9%)	192 (4.7%)	20.8%	138,495	148,663 (6.8%)	150,436 (1.2%)	7.9%	+12.9%
2	Beaufort Hyde Martin Tyrrell Washington	82	81 (-1.2%)	83 (2.4%)	1.2%	93,627	95,577 (2.0%)	93,988 (-1.7%)	0.4%	+0.8%
3A	Pitt	242	266 (9.0%)	280 (5.0%)	13.6%	144,233	168,827 (14.6%)	174,414 (3.2%)	17.3%	(-3.7%)
3B	Carteret Craven Pamlico	277	306 (9.5%)	318 (3.8%)	12.9%	169,136	184,000 (8.1%)	187,008 (1.6%)	9.6%	+3.3%
4	Duplin Jones Onslow Sampson	186	212 (12.3%)	233 (9.0%)	20.2%	285,313	319,187 (10.6%)	328,217 (2.8%)	13.1%	+7.1%
5	New Hanover Pender	545	702 (22.4%)	803 (12.6%)	32.1%	221,971	255,734 (13.2%)	273,491 (6.5%)	18.8%	+13.3%
6	Bertie Halifax Hertford Northampton	114	95 (-20.0%)	91 (-4.4%)	(-25.3%)	121,545	122,518 (0.8%)	119,623 (-2.4%)	(-1.6%)	(-23.7%)

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
7	Edgecombe Nash Wilson	291	290 (-0.3%)	284 (-2.1%)	(-2.5%)	221,425	233,819 (5.3%)	231,407 (-1.0%)	4.3%	(-6.8%)
8	Greene Lenoir Wayne	175	184 (4.9%)	191 (3.7%)	8.4%	195,606	203,553 (3.9%)	205,798 (1.1%)	5.0%	+3.4%
9	Franklin Granville Vance Warren	133	147 (9.5%)	155 (5.2%)	14.2%	170,821	184,666 (7.5%)	186,921 (1.2%)	8.6%	+5.6%
9A	Caswell Person	45	44 (-2.3%)	28 (-57.1%)	(-60.7%)	60,750	63,121 (3.8%)	62,874 (-0.4%)	3.4%	(-64.1%)
10	Wake	3524	4528 (22.2%)	5444 (16.8%)	35.3%	721,246	906,910 (20.5%)	985,320 (8.0%)	26.8%	+8.5%
11A	Harnett Lee	149	161 (7.5%)	175 (8.0%)	14.9%	150,764	173,603 (13.2%)	184,922 (6.1%)	18.5%	(-3.6%)
11B	Johnston	149	162 (8.0%)	175 (7.4%)	14.9%	139,658	169,612 (17.7%)	180,050 (5.8%)	22.4%	(-7.6%)
12	Cumberland	323	381 (15.2%)	390 (2.3%)	17.2%	307,837	327,435 (6.0%)	329,411 (0.6%)	6.5%	+10.6%
13	Bladen Brunswick Columbus	162	198 (18.2%)	221 (10.4%)	26.7%	172,759	201,213 (14.1%)	210,610 (4.5%)	18.0%	+8.7%
14	Durham	966	1141 (15.3%)	1406 (18.8%)	31.3%	237,571	271,303 (12.4%)	292,194 (7.1%)	18.7%	+12.6%
15A	Alamance	166	174 (4.6%)	195 (10.8%)	14.9%	137,027	151,550 (9.6%)	155,788 (2.7%)	12.0%	+2.8%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
15B	Chatham Orange	616	770 (20.0%)	894 (13.9%)	31.1%	175,903	197,839 (11.1%)	208,656 (5.2%)	15.7%	+15.4%
16A	Hoke Scotland	52	51 (-2.0%)	53 (3.8%)	1.9%	74,193	83,663 (11.3%)	87,046 (3.9%)	14.8%	(-12.9%)
16B	Robeson	88	102 (13.7%)	111 (8.1%)	20.7%	126,306	134,438 (6.0%)	133,562 (-0.7%)	5.4%	+15.3%
16C	Anson Richmond	-	61	69 (11.6%)	11.6%	72,199	73,491 (1.8%)	72,007 (-2.1%)	(-0.3%)	+13.7%
17A	Rockingham	66	73 (9.6%)	75 (2.7%)	12.0%	92,197	93,604 (1.5%)	92,557 (-1.1%)	0.4%	+11.6%
17B	Stokes Surry	87	90 (3.3%)	102 (11.8%)	14.7%	117,488	121,054 (2.9%)	120,626 (-0.4%)	2.6%	+12.1%
18/18H	Guilford	1220	1391 (12.3%)	1519 (8.4%)	19.7%	436,845	489,479 (10.8%)	512,281 (4.5%)	14.7%	+5.0%
19A	Cabarrus	137	166 (17.5%)	186 (10.8%)	26.3%	146,053	178,690 (18.3%)	191,080 (6.5%)	23.6%	+2.8%
19B	Montgomery Randolph	96	109 (11.9%)	114 (4.4%)	15.8%	161,132	169,904 (5.2%)	170,898 (0.6%)	5.7%	+10.1%
19C	Rowan	116	132 (12.1%)	146 (9.6%)	20.5%	131,247	138,342 (5.1%)	138,709 (0.3%)	5.4%	+15.2%
19D	Moore	118	138 (14.5%)	143 (3.5%)	17.5%	79,159	88,554 (10.6%)	93,079 (4.9%)	15.0%	+2.5%
20A	Stanly	-	45	50 (10.0%)	10.0%	58,640	60,567 (3.2%)	61,061 (0.8%)	4.0%	+9.2%
20B	Union	-	136	204 (33.3%)	33.3%	151,102	202,171 (25.3%)	215,956 (6.4%)	30.0%	+26.9%
21	Forsyth	1080	1158 (6.7%)	1258 (7.9%)	14.1%	319,220	351,394 (9.2%)	364,258 (3.5%)	12.4%	+1.8%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
22A	Alexander Iredell	-	206	258 (20.2%)	20.2%	170,693	197,100 (13.4%)	204,990 (3.8%)	16.7%	+16.4%
22B	Davidson Davie	-	180	191 (5.8%)	5.8%	190,153	204,220 (6.9%)	205,938 (0.8%)	7.7%	+5.0%
23	Alleghany Ashe Wilkes Yadkin	107	121 (11.6%)	127 (4.7%)	15.7%	140,174	146,044 (4.0%)	146,295 (0.2%)	4.2%	+11.6%
24	Avery Madison Mitchell Watauga Yancey	132	153 (13.7%)	159 (3.8)	17.0%	116,285	122,858 (5.4%)	126,147 (2.6%)	7.8%	+9.2%
25	Burke Caldwell Catawba	304	329 (7.6%)	317 (-3.8%)	4.1%	313,680	328,045 (4.4%)	327,477 (-0.2%)	4.2%	(-0.1%)
26	Mecklenburg	3247	4233 (23.3%)	5174 (18.2%)	37.2%	774,020	923,417 (16.2%)	1,013,290 (8.9%)	23.6%	+13.6%
27A	Gaston	194	229 (15.3%)	284 (19.4%)	31.7%	190,038	206,081 (7.8%)	21,0745 (2.2%)	9.8%	+21.9%
27B	Cleveland Lincoln	110	121 (9.1%)	86 (-40.7%)	(-27.9%)	164,773	176,456 (6.6%)	178,112 (0.9%)	7.5%	(-35.4%)
28	Buncombe	513	609 (15.8%)	740 (17.7%)	30.7%	217,323	238,857 (9.0%)	251,271 (4.9%)	13.5%	+17.2%
29A	McDowell Rutherford	-	85	95 (10.5%)	10.5%	107,284	112,844 (4.9%)	112,920 (0.1%)	5.0%	+10.4%
29B	Henderson Polk Transylvania	-	180	215 (16.3%)	16.3%	145,322	160,429 (9.4%)	165,098 (2.8%)	12.0%	+13.5%

Active Lawyers by Judicial District vs. District Population

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

Jud. Dis.	Counties	District Active Lawyers 2004	District Active Lawyers 2010	District Active Lawyers 10/05/15	Total % Change '04-'15	District Population 2004	District Population 2010	District Population 2014*	Total Change '04-'14	Lawyer Change vs. Population Change
30	Cherokee Clay Graham Haywood Jackson Macon Swain	189	244 (22.5%)	248 (1.6%)	23.8%	181,217	194,085 (6.6%)	197,156 (1.6%)	8.1%	+15.7%
	North Carolina*		20,181	23,739 (15.0%)		8,542,430	9,426,254 (9.4%)	9,953,687 (5.3%)	14.2%	
	Average		459	540 (15.0%)			219,215 (8.8%)	226,220 (2.4%)	10.9%	+4.7%
	Median		170	192 (11.5%)			178,690 (7.6%)	185,921 (1.9%)	9.1%	+8.9%

*23,616 Lawyers active and residing in North Carolina (There are 28,009 total active lawyers with a North Carolina law license). Population estimates are from the North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management. For districts without 2004 data, total percentage change of the lawyer population was calculated for 2010-15 and compared with district population change from 2010-2014.

*****THIS DATA HAS NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY VERIFIED AND SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AN APPROXIMATE REPRESENTATION*****

2014 Grievance Files

1180 total files evaluated

Number of files per group of lawyers licensed:

Prior to 1970	27 (2.3%)
1970-1979	157 (13.3%)
1980-1989	242 (20.5%)
1990-1999	347 (29.4%)
2000-2009	320 (27.1%)
2010-2014	87 (7.4%)

Approx. Number of Active lawyers per group:

Note: This data has not been sufficiently verified and should only be considered an approximate representation of the lawyer population in 2014.

Prior to 1970	782	(2.8%)
1970-1979	2,517	(8.9%)
1980-1989	3,891	(13.9%)
1990-1999	6,151	(22%)
2000-2009	9,148	(32.7%)
2010-2014	5,516	(19.7%)

	<u>Files Dismissed</u>	<u>D-LOC</u>	<u>D-LOW</u>
Prior 1970	19 (70%)	0	0
1970-1979	109 (69%)	4	1
1980-1989	168 (69%)	0	6
1990-1999	249 (72%)	4	13
2000-2009	243 (76%)	5	9
2010-2014	59 (68%)	2	6

	<u>Admonitions</u>	<u>Reprimands</u>	<u>Censures</u>
Prior 1970	0	0	0
1970-1979	2	3	0
1980-1989	10	1	0
1990-1999	9	8	3
2000-2009	8	7	1
2010-2014	1	2	0

	<u>DHC</u>	<u>Pending</u>
Prior 1970	1	7
1970-1979	6 (4 lawyers)	32
1980-1989	20 (15 lawyers)	37
1990-1999	17 (11 lawyers)	44
2000-2009	7 (5 lawyers)	40
2010-2014	7 (3 lawyers)	10