



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

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

J. Denis Moran
Director of State Courts

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

March 2016

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of March 2016 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2015.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions involving 11 cases in March. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>March 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>11</u>	<u>55</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	3	25
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	4	22
Criminal cases	4	8

Petitions for Review

A total of 54 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 March, the Supreme Court disposed of 64 petitions for review, of which 3 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 180 petitions for review pending.

	<u>March 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>54</u>	<u>375</u>
Civil cases	25	164
Criminal cases	29	211

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>64</u>	<u>386</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	29 (0)	196 (20)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	35 (3)	190 (16)

Petitions for Bypass

In March, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of no 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 1 petition for bypass pending.

	<u>March 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Civil cases	0	2
Criminal cases.....	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	5 (2)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During March 2016, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of no 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 6 requests for certification pending.

	<u>March 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>
Civil cases	0	3
Criminal cases.....	0	5
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 10 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 3 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 6 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 37 regulatory matters and 10 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>March 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	13	49
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	6	19
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	2
<u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	4
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	0	17
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	6

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING March 2016

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2015AP1649-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. John O. Waters License Suspended Per Curiam ¹	03/09/2016
2015AP284-D	OLR v. Thor Templin License Suspension Per Curiam <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, J.	03/29/2016
2015AP2032-D	OLR v. Leonard G. Adent Public Reprimand Per Curiam <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. joined by Bradley, J.	03/29/2016

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2013AP613/ 2013AP687	Wisconsin Pharmacal Company, LLC v. Nebraska Cultures of California, Inc. Court of Appeals decision reversed and remanded. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C.J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. joined by A.W. Bradley, J. Ziegler, J. and R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	03/01/2016
2014AP1880	United Food v. Hormel Foods Corporation Judgment /Order of circuit court affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, J. <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : Roggensack, C.J. joined by Prosser, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Gableman, J. joined by Ziegler, J. R.G. Bradley, J. did not participate.	03/01/2016

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

2014AP1248-CR } State v. Patrick K. Tourville 03/15/2016
2014AP1249-CR } Court of Appeals decision affirmed.
2014AP1250-CR } Majority Opinion: A.W. Bradley, J.
2014AP1251-CR }

2014AP1508 Patti J. Roberts v. T.H.E. Insurance Company 03/30/2016
Court of Appeals decision reversed and remanded to the
circuit court.
Majority Opinion: A.W. Bradley, J.
Concur: Ziegler, J.
Concur/Dissent: Prosser, J. joined by Roggensack, C.J.
Dissent: R.G. Bradley, J. joined by Prosser, J. except for
footnote 4.