



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

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

APRIL 2012

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

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 9 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 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>9</u>	<u>51</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	6	26
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	2	16
Criminal cases	1	9

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 68 petitions for review, of which 1 petition was granted. The Supreme Court currently has 214 petitions for review pending.

	<u>April 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>71</u>	<u>515</u>
Civil cases	47	262
Criminal cases	24	253

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>68</u>	<u>625</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	33 (0)	306 (23)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	35 (1)	319 (11)

Petitions for Bypass

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

	<u>April 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>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	5 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	1 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During April 2012, the Supreme Court received 1 request for certification and disposed of 2 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 1 request for certification pending.

	<u>April 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Civil cases	1	5
Criminal cases	0	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	2 (0)	5 (2)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (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 9 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. 1 original action was 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 44 regulatory matters and 13 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>April 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	3	50
Judicial discipline.....	0	1
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	9	49
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	6
<u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	11
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	7	49
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	7

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2012

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2010AP3013-D	OLR v. Benjamin C. Butler 30 Day Suspension Per Curiam ¹ Bradley, J. withdrew from participation	04/04/2012
2010AP3014-D	OLR v. Stephan Walter Addison 60 Day Suspension Per Curiam <u>Dissent:</u> Roggensack, J., joined by Crooks, J. Bradley, J. withdrew from participation	04/04/2012
2011AP777-D	OLR v. John R. Loew Public Reprimand Per Curiam	04/27/2012
1993AP1135-D, 1994AP1838-D and 1996AP884-D	BAPR v. Stanley V. Woodard Reinstatement Granted Per Curiam	04/27/2012

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2010AP346-CR	State v. Devin W. Felix Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Crooks, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Prosser, J.	04/03/2012

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

2010AP177	Suzanne R. May v. Michael T. May Circuit Court decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Bradley, J.	04/03/2012
2008AP1972	Thomas W. Jandre v. Physicians Insurance Company of Wisconsin Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Dissent</u> : Roggensack, J. joined by Ziegler, J. and Gableman, J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Prosser, J.	04/17/2012