



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

(608) 266-1880

CLERK@WICOURTS.GOV

WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM

Annette Kingsland Ziegler
Chief Justice

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

FEBRUARY 2025

This statistical report provides an overview of case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court from February and for the term that began on September 1, 2024.

OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

The Supreme Court issued three opinions in February. Information about issued opinions, including the Court’s disposition and the names of the authoring justices, can be found in the attached [table](#).

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	3	12
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	1	7
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Civil Cases</i>	2	5
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	0

PETITIONS FOR REVIEW

A petition for review is a request made to the Supreme Court to review the decision made by the Court of Appeals. It is important to note that the Supreme Court has discretionary jurisdiction, which means that it only grants review in selected cases. During February 40 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 53 petitions for review during the month, four of which was granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 177 petitions for review that are still pending.

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Petitions for Review filed	40	277
<i>Civil Cases</i>	10	121
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	30	156
Petitions for Review dispositions	53	309
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	20 (1)	152 (9)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	33 (3)	157 (8)

PETITIONS FOR BYPASS

A petition for bypass is a request made by a party to the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding that is pending in the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court February consider a case appropriate for bypass if it meets one or more of the criteria for review. In such cases, the Supreme Court will ultimately decide to consider the matter, regardless of how the Court of Appeals February decide the issues. This type of petition may also be granted where there is a clear need to speed up the ultimate appellate decision. In February, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of one petition. The Supreme Court currently has 15 petitions for bypass pending.

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Petitions for Bypass filed	0	7
<i>Civil Cases</i>	0	7
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	0
Petitions for Bypass dispositions	1	11
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	1 (0)	11 (4)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)

Requests for Certification

A request for certification arises when the Court of Appeals calls upon the Supreme Court to hear a case before the Court of Appeals has had the opportunity to do so. This type of request is typically made when the Court of Appeals believes that the case is of such significance that it is essential for the Supreme Court to consider it at the earliest opportunity.

The criteria for evaluating such a request are the same as those used when assessing a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court considers various factors, including the importance of the issues at stake, the likelihood that the case will return to the Supreme Court if it is not heard, and whether the case would benefit from the Supreme Court's guidance.

If the Supreme Court decides to grant the request for certification, it means that it will consider the case first, before the Court of Appeals has had the opportunity to hear it. If the Supreme Court declines the request, the case will proceed to the Court of Appeals in the usual way. During February, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of none. The Supreme Court currently has two requests for certification pending.

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Requests for Certification filed	0	2
<i>Civil Cases</i>	0	1
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	1
Requests for Certification dispositions	0	0
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, five matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no cases were reopened. The Supreme Court received seven petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order a lower court to take a certain action in a case. The Supreme Court currently has 26 regulatory matters and 11 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

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. No original actions were filed.

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Filings <i>(including reopened cases)</i>	7	56
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	1	18
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	1	2
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	0
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	5	21
<i>Other (including Original Actions)</i>	0	4

	<i>February 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Dispositions by Order <i>(including reopened cases)</i>	14	48
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	0
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	12	39
<i>Other (Including Original Actions)</i>	2	9

DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING FEBRUARY 2025

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2023AP2369	<u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Osman A. Mirza</u> Per Curiam. The referee’s April 11, 2024 report is vacated, and the matter is remanded to the referee for further proceedings.	02/27/2005
2024AP232	<u>Kenneth Brown v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</u> The judgment and order of the circuit court are reversed, and the cause remanded. KAROFKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET, and PROTASIEWICZ, J.J., joined. ZIEGLER, C.J., filed a dissenting opinion. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a dissenting opinion in which ZIEGLER, C.J., joined with respect to ¶¶44-44, and in which HAGEDORN, J., joined with respect to ¶¶28-43.	02/18/2025
2024AP351	<u>Wisconsin Elections Commission v. Devin LeMahieu</u> The judgment and order of the circuit court are affirmed in part, and the cause is remanded to the circuit court. ZIEGLER, C.J., delivered the unanimous opinion of the Court. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which DALLET and KAROFKY, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., joined.	02/07/2025