



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Patience Drake Roggensack
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

April 2015

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of April 2015 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2014.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 12 cases in April. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>April 2015</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>11</u>	<u>67</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	5	33
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	2	15
Criminal cases	4	19

Petitions for Review

A total of 71 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 April, the Supreme Court disposed of 67 petitions for review, of which 4 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 198 petitions for review pending.

	<u>April 2015</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>71</u>	<u>505</u>
Civil cases	39	243
Criminal cases	32	262

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>67</u>	<u>603</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	34 (3)	293 (25)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	33 (1)	310 (20)

Petitions for Bypass

In April, the Supreme Court received 1 petition for bypass and disposed of 1 petition 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 3 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>April 2015</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Civil cases	1	5
Criminal cases	0	2
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	1 (1)	13 (6)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	2 (0)

Requests for Certification

During April 2015, the Supreme Court received 1 request 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 2 requests for certification pending.

	<u>April 2015</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases	0	4
Criminal cases	1	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (3)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 6 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 0 such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 5 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 34 regulatory matters and 11 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>April 2015</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	45
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	1	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	5	30
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	5
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	3
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	1	39
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	6

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING April 2015

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2013AP2300-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Howard B. Mitz Public Reprimand Per Curiam ¹	04/03/2015
2014AP2906-D	OLR v. Jon Evenson License Suspended Per Curiam	04/16/2015
2014AP569-D	OLR v. Ernesto Chavez License Suspended Per Curiam	04/17/2015
2014AP41-D	OLR v. Paul G. Belke License Suspended Per Curiam	04/24/2015
2014AP2125-D	OLR v. Jeff D. Stobbe Public Reprimand Per Curiam	04/28/2015

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2013AP265	Mauricio Aguilar v. Husco International, Inc. Court of Appeals Decision Reversed and Remanded <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Crooks, J.	04/01/2015
2009AP3073-CR	State v. Michael R. Griep Court of Appeals Decision Affirmed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, J. <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. joined by Bradley, J. Prosser, J. withdrew from participation.	04/23/2015

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

2013AP218-CR 2013AP1737-CR	State v. Jessica M. Weissinger State v. Michael R. Luedtke Court of Appeals Decision Affirmed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Gableman, J. <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, C.J.	04/24/2015
2012AP2692-CR	State v. Roddee W. Daniel Court of Appeals Decision Affirmed and Cause Remanded to the Circuit Court <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Bradley, J. Prosser, J. did not participate.	04/29/2015
2013AP1392-CR	Runzheimer International, Ltd. v. David Friedlen Court of Appeals Decision is Reversed and Cause Remanded to Circuit Court <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Prosser, J. <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, C.J.	04/30/2015