



# 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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

J. Denis Moran  
Director of State Courts

Diane M. Fremgen  
Clerk of Supreme Court

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### June 2016

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

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions involving 10 cases in June. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>June 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>10</u>	<u>85</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	1	34
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar admission cases.. ..	0	1
Civil cases .....	7	36
Criminal cases .....	2	14

#### Petitions for Review

A total of 57 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 June, the Supreme Court disposed of 76 petitions for review, of which 5 petition was granted. The Supreme Court currently has 129 petitions for review pending.

	<u>June 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	<u>57</u>	<u>530</u>
Civil cases .....	34	245
Criminal cases .....	23	285

Petition for Review dispositions .....	<u>76</u>	<u>592</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	42 (3)	291 (28)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	34 (2)	301 (21)

Petitions for Bypass

In June, the Supreme Court received 1 petition 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>June 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases .....	1	3
Criminal cases .....	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	6 (2)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During June 2016, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of 1 request 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 no requests for certification pending.

	<u>June 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed .....	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases .....	0	4
Criminal cases .....	0	5
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases (requests granted) .....	1 (1)	4 (4)
Criminal cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	5 (3)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 3 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no such cases were 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 35 regulatory matters and 8 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>June 2016</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	3	58
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	5	28
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	2
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	6
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	1	26
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	8

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

**OPINIONS ISSUED DURING June 2016**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2015AP1433-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Matthew S. MacLean License Suspended Per Curiam <sup>1</sup>	06/03/2016

**CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2013AP2316-CR	State v. Richard J. Sulla Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Gableman, J. <u>Concur</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	06/14/2016
2014AP400	Milwaukee Police Association v. City of Milwaukee Court of Appeals decision affirmed in part and reversed in part. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Gableman, J. <u>Concur</u> : R.G. Bradley <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. and A.W. Bradley, J.	06/23/2016
2014AP1177	John Doe 56 v. Mayo Clinic Health System - Eau Claire Clinic, Inc. Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : R.G. Bradley, J. <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	06/23/2016
2014AP2097 2014AP2295	Prince Corporation v. James N. Vandenberg Court of Appeals decision reversed in part, affirmed in part and remanded. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C.J. <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. joined by A.W. Bradley	06/23/2016

---

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

2014AP827-CR	State v. Rory A. McKellips Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : R.G. Bradley, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. joined by A.W. Bradley, J. Prosser, J. did not participate.	06/28/2016
2014AP821	Fontana Builders, Inc. v. Assurance Company of America Court of Appeals decision reversed and remanded to the circuit court. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Prosser, J. <u>Concur</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J. <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : R.G. Bradley, J.	06/29/2016
2013AP2756	David M. Marks v. Houston Casualty Company Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Concur</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J. <u>Concur</u> : R.G. Bradley, J.	06/30/2016
2014AP2484	Water Well Solutions Service Group Inc. v. Consolidated Insurance Company Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : R.G. Bradley, J. <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	06/30/2016