



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Shirley S. Abrahamson
Chief Justice

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Supreme Court

Telephone (608) 266-1880

TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880

Fax (608) 267-0640

Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

August 2014

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of August 2014 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2013.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 9 cases in August. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>August 2014</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>9</u>	<u>123</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	7	54
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Civil cases	0	39
Criminal cases	2	30

Petitions for Review

A total of 68 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In August, the Supreme Court disposed of 98 petitions for review, of which 3 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 295 petitions for review pending.

	<u>August 2014</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>68</u>	<u>792</u>
Civil cases	32	381
Criminal cases.....	36	411

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>98</u>	<u>860</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	39 (1)	421 (28)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	59 (2)	439 (37)

Petitions for Bypass

In August, the Supreme Court received 5 petitions for bypass and disposed of 2 petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has 16 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>August 2014</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed.....	<u>5</u>	<u>24</u>
Civil cases	4	20
Criminal cases	1	4
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	2 (0)	12 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	4 (0)

Requests for Certification

During August 2014, the Supreme Court received 0 requests for certification and disposed of 0 requests for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has 0 requests for certification pending.

	<u>August 2014</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Civil cases	0	2
Criminal cases	0	1
Request for Certification dispositions.....	0	<u>7</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	4 (4)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 2 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 1 such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 2 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original actions were filed. 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. The Supreme Court currently has 26 regulatory matters and 18 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>August 2014</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	3	63
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	2	73
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	6
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	4
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	10	76
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	10

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING August 2014

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2011AP584-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Michael D. Mandelman License Revoked Per Curiam ¹	08/01/2014
2012AP1965-D	OLR v. Joseph L. Sommers Public Reprimand Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Dissent</u> : Crooks, J. Ziegler, J. and Gableman, J. did not participate.	08/05/2014
1984AP970-D	OLR v. John J. Balistrieri Reinstatement Denied Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, J. Roggensack, J. withdrew from participation.	08/12/2014
2013AP2702-D	OLR v. Jerry R. Albert Public Reprimand Per Curiam	08/20/2014
2014AP337-D	OLR v. Rebekah Mariya Nett License Suspension Per Curiam	08/20/2014
2014AP517-D	OLR v. Brian Campbell Fischer Public Reprimand Per Curiam	08/20/2014
2013AP1733-D	OLR v. John R. Dade License Suspension Per Curiam	08/21/2014

¹ “Per Curiam” means “by the Court.” Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2012AP1307-CR	State v. Jeremiah J. Purtell Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Gableman, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, C.J.	08/01/2014
2012AP2185-CR	State v. James R. Hunt Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Gableman, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, C.J. and Prosser, J.	08/01/2014