



Jill J. Karofsky  
Chief Justice

# Supreme Court of Wisconsin

## OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

(608) 266-1880

[CLERK@WICOURTS.GOV](mailto:CLERK@WICOURTS.GOV)

[WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM](http://WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM)

Samuel A. Christensen  
Clerk of Supreme Court

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### JUNE 2026

This statistical report provides an overview of case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court for the month of June and for the term that began on September 1, 2025.

#### OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

The Supreme Court issued seven opinions in June. Information about issued opinions, including the Court's disposition and the names of the authoring justices, can be found in the attached [table](#).

|                                                  | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Total number of cases resolved by opinion</i> | 7                | 15                  |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>               | 1                | 11                  |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>               | 0                | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admissions</i>                            | 0                | 0                   |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                               | 3                | 7                   |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                            | 3                | 7                   |

#### PETITIONS FOR REVIEW

A petition for review is a request made to the Supreme Court to review the decision made by the Court of Appeals. It is important to note that the Supreme Court has discretionary jurisdiction, which means that it only grants review in selected cases. During June, 77 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 73 petitions for review during the month, three of which was granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 422 petitions for review that are still pending.

|                                           | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Petitions for Review filed</i>         | 77               | 580                 |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                        | 40               | 271                 |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                     | 37               | 309                 |
| <i>Petitions for Review dispositions</i>  | 73               | 414                 |
| <i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>    | 32 (3)           | 193 (19)            |
| <i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i> | 41 (0)           | 221 (7)             |

### PETITIONS FOR BYPASS

A petition for bypass is a request for the Supreme Court to assume jurisdiction over an appeal other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court can grant such a petition if the case meets one or more criteria for review, or if there is a compelling need to expedite the appellate process. When a bypass is granted, the Supreme Court will decide the matter directly, regardless of any potential decision by the Court of Appeals.

In June, the Supreme Court received two petitions for bypass and disposed of no petitions. The Supreme Court currently has three petitions for bypass pending.

|                                           | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Petitions for Bypass filed</i>         | 2                | 11                  |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                        | 2                | 9                   |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                     | 0                | 2                   |
| <i>Petitions for Bypass dispositions</i>  | 0                | 11                  |
| <i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>    | 0 (0)            | 8 (0)               |
| <i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i> | 0 (0)            | 3 (0)               |

### Requests for Certification

A request for certification arises when the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to hear a case before the Court of Appeals has had the opportunity to do so. This type of request is typically made when the Court of Appeals believes that the case is of such significance that it is essential for the Supreme Court to consider it at the earliest opportunity.

The criteria for evaluating such a request are the same as those used when assessing a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court considers various factors, including the importance of the issues at stake, the likelihood that the case will return to the Supreme Court if it is not heard, and whether the case would benefit from the Supreme Court's guidance.

If the Supreme Court decides to grant the request for certification, it means that it will consider the case first, before the Court of Appeals has had the opportunity to hear it. If the Supreme Court declines the request, the case will proceed to the Court of Appeals in the usual way. During June, the Supreme Court received one requests for certification and disposed of none. The Supreme Court currently has one request for certification pending.

|                                                | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Requests for Certification filed</i>        | 1                | 1                   |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                             | 0                | 0                   |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                          | 1                | 1                   |
| <i>Requests for Certification dispositions</i> | 0                | 1                   |
| <i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>         | 0 (0)            | 1 (1)               |
| <i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>      | 0 (0)            | 0 (0)               |

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, two matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no cases were reopened. The Supreme Court received four petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order a lower court to take a certain action in a case. The Supreme Court currently has 15 regulatory matters and 31 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in “Opinions Issued by the Court” above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. No original actions were filed in June.

|                                                               | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Total number of Filings<br/>(including reopened cases)</i> | 6                | 106                 |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>                            | 2                | 18                  |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>                            | 0                | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admission</i>                                          | 0                | 1                   |
| <i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>                         | 4                | 77                  |
| <i>Other (including Original Actions)</i>                     | 0                | 10                  |

  

|                                                                             | <i>June 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Total number of Dispositions by Order<br/>(including reopened cases)</i> | 5                | 97                  |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>                                          | 0                | 6                   |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>                                          | 0                | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admission</i>                                                        | 0                | 1                   |
| <i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>                                       | 5                | 77                  |
| <i>Other (Including Original Actions)</i>                                   | 0                | 13                  |

DECISIONS BY THE  
**WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**  
 OPINIONS ISSUED DURING JUNE 2026

| <u><b>Docket No.</b></u>                     | <u><b>Title</b></u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <u><b>Date</b></u> |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 2022AP182<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 19</a> )  | <u>Koble Investments v. Elicia Marquardt</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals was reversed.</b><br>REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., and ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, REBECCA FRANK DALLET, BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., joined. SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., filed a concurring opinion.                                                                                                                                               | 06/05/2026         |
| 2022AP937<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 21</a> )  | <u>Legend Lake Property Owners Association, Inc. v. Guy Keshena</u><br><b>The judgment of the circuit court was affirmed.</b><br>SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., and REBECCA FRANK DALLET and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., joined. BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, J., filed a dissenting opinion in which ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER and REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, JJ., joined.                                                                                                    | 06/23/2026         |
| 2022AP2026<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 20</a> ) | <u>Konkanok Rabiebna v. Higher Educational Aids Board</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals was affirmed.</b><br>ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined, and in which JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., and REBECCA FRANK DALLET and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined with respect to ¶¶17–20. JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., filed a concurring opinion, in which SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., joined. REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., joined. | 06/18/2026         |

|                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |            |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 2023AP722-CR<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 22</a> ) | <u>State v. N. K. B.</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals was affirmed.</b><br>REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which JILL J. KAROFISKY, C.J., and BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion. ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., filed a dissenting opinion                                                                                                                                | 06/26/2026 |
| 2024AP250<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 23</a> )    | <u>Outagamie County v. M. J. B.</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals was reversed.</b><br>SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 06/26/2026 |
| 2024AP1019-D<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 18</a> ) | <u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Gary W. Thompson</u><br><b>Attorney Disciplinary Proceedings. Attorney was publicly reprimanded.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 06/01/2026 |
| 2024AP1390<br>( <a href="#">2026 WI 24</a> )   | <u>Waukesha County v. R. D. T.</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals was reversed.</b><br>REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which JILL J. KAROFISKY, C.J., and BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined. REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which JILL J. KAROFISKY, C.J., and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, J., joined. ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., joined. | 06/30/2026 |