



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

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

Patience Drake Roggensack
Chief Justice

Hon. Randy R. Koschnick
Director of State Courts

Diane M. Fremgen
Acting Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

December 2017

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of December 2017 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2017.

Opinions Issued by the Court

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

	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>9</u>	<u>18</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	5	12
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar admission cases.....	0	0
Civil cases	2	4
Criminal cases	2	2

Petitions for Review

A total of 45 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 December, the Supreme Court disposed of 64 petitions for review, of which 1 petition was granted. The Supreme Court currently has 162 petitions for review pending.

	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>45</u>	<u>212</u>
Civil cases	14	104
Criminal cases.....	31	108

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>64</u>	<u>313</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	28 (0)	143 (10)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	36 (1)	170 (8)

Petitions for Bypass

In December 2017, the Supreme Court received 1 petition for bypass and disposed of 0 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 4 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases	0	3
Criminal cases	1	3
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	3 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	3 (2)

Requests for Certification

During December 2017, 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 no requests for certification pending.

	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	1	1
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (3)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, there were 7 matters filed within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) and 2 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 3 petitions for supervisory writ, which asks 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 36 regulatory matters and 10 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	9	22
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	3	17
Other (including Original Actions and Certified Questions).	0	2
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	1
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	4	19
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	4

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING DECEMBER 2017

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2016AP563-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Michael D. Petersen License Suspension Per Curiam ¹ <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	12/15/2017
2017AP539-D	OLR v. Ronald L. Brandt License Revoked Per Curiam <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, J.	12/15/2017
2015AP1928-D	OLR v. Robert W. Horsch License Suspension Per Curiam <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J.	12/21/2017
2017AP1168-D	OLR v. Alan R. Stewart License Suspension Per Curiam	12/21/2017
2017AP2036-D	OLR v. Jeffrey M. Blessinger License Revoked Per Curiam <u>Concur</u> : Bradley, A. W., J.	12/21/2017

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2015AP1610-CR	State v. Ginger M. Breitzman Decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, J.	12/01/2017
2015AP2041-CR	State v. Jose Alberto Reyes Fuerte Decision of the Court of Appeals is reversed.	12/19/2017

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

Majority Opinion: Gableman, J.

Dissent: Abrahamson, J. joined by Bradley, A. W., J.

2012AP2377
2015AP870

Debra K. Sands v. John R. Menard, Jr.

12/29/2017

Decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed.

Majority Opinion: Roggensack, C. J.

Concur/Dissent: Abrahamson, J. joined by Bradley, A. W., J.