



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

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### MAY 2012

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of May 2012 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2011.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 14 cases in May. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>May 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>14</u>	<u>65</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	5	31
Judicial disciplinary cases .....	0	0
Civil cases .....	8	24
Criminal cases .....	1	10

#### 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 May, the Supreme Court disposed of 45 petitions for review, of which 6 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 238 petitions for review pending.

	<u>May 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	<u>68</u>	<u>583</u>
Civil cases .....	30	292
Criminal cases .....	38	291

Petition for Review dispositions .....	<u>45</u>	<u>669</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	26 (5)	332 (28)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	19 (1)	337 (12)

### Petitions for Bypass

In May, the Supreme Court received no petitions 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 no petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>May 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases .....	0	3
Criminal cases .....	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	5 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	1 (0)

### Requests for Certification

During May 2012, the Supreme Court received 2 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 2 requests for certification pending.

	<u>May 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed .....	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases .....	0	5
Criminal cases .....	2	4
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases (requests granted) .....	1 (1)	6 (3)
Criminal cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	3 (3)

### Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 5 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 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 43 regulatory matters and 15 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>May 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	55
Judicial discipline.....	0	1
Bar admission.....	1	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	6	55
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	6
<u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	11
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	3	52
Other (including Original Actions).....	2	9

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

**OPINIONS ISSUED DURING May 2012**

**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2011AP817-D	OLR v. J. Manuel Raneda 1 Year Suspension Per Curiam	05/01/2012
2011AP778-D	OLR v. T. Aaron J. Rollins 60 Day Suspension Per Curiam	05/09/2012
2011AP142-D	OLR v. Anne E. Brown 2 Year Suspension Per Curiam	05/18/2012
2010AP2566-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Bridget E. Boyle 60 Day Suspension Per Curiam <sup>1</sup>	05/23/2012
2011AP1654-D	OLR v. T. Christopher Kelly 60 Day Revocation Per Curiam	05/23/2012

**CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2010AP1474	Best Price Plumbing, Inc. v. Erie Insurance Exchange Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Bradley, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Ziegler, J., joined by Roggensack, J.	05/03/2012

---

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

2010AP2023	<p>The Lamar Company, LLC v. Country Side Restaurant, Inc.  Court of Appeals decision reversed and cause remanded to the circuit court.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Ziegler, J.</p>	05/04/2012
2010AP208	<p>Aurora Consolidated Health Care v. Labor and Industry Review Commission  Court of Appeals decision affirmed.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Bradley, J.  <u>Dissent:</u> Roggensack, J.  Prosser, J. did not participate.</p>	05/11/2012
2010AP2061	<p>Fond du Lac County v. Helen E. F.  Court of Appeals decision affirmed.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Gableman, J.  <u>Concurrence:</u> Abrahamson, C.J., joined by Bradley, J.  Prosser, J. did not participate.</p>	05/18/2012
2010AP784	<p>State v. Tyler T.  Court of Appeals decision affirmed.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Zeigler, J.  <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, C.J.  Prosser, J. did not participate.</p>	05/22/2012
2010AP1785	<p>Joyce Aldrich v. LIRC  Court of Appeals decision reversed and cause remanded to the LIRC.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Abrahamson, C.J.</p>	05/23/2012
2010AP826	<p>Marco A. Marquez v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC  Circuit Court judgment affirmed.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Abrahamson, C.J.  <u>Concurrence/Dissent:</u> Roggensack, J.</p>	05/24/2012
2009AP2176	<p>Dawn L. Maxwell v. Hartford Union High School District  Court of Appeals decision reversed.  <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Prosser, J.  <u>Dissent:</u> Crooks, J. joined by Abrahamson, C.J. and Bradley, J.</p>	05/30/2012

2010AP1551-CR

State v. Douglas Meier Williams  
Circuit Court Judgment affirmed.  
Majority Opinion: Roggensack, J.  
Concurrence: Abrahamson, C.J.  
Prosser, J. did not participate.

05/30/2012