



Ann Walsh Bradley
Chief Justice

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

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

APRIL 2025

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

OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

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

	<i>April 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	6	19
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	2	9
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admissions</i>	0	1
<i>Civil Cases</i>	4	9
<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 April 41 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 50 petitions for review during the month, none of which were granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 134 petitions for review that are still pending.

	<i>April 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Petitions for Review filed	41	378
<i>Civil Cases</i>	21	167
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	20	211
Petitions for Review dispositions	50	428
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	23 (0)	213 (11)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	27 (0)	235 (9)

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 can 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 may decide the issues. This type of petition could also be granted where there is a clear need to speed up the ultimate appellate decision. In April, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of no petitions. The Supreme Court currently has 15 petitions for bypass pending.

	<i>April 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	0	11
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (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 April, the Supreme Court received one request for certification and disposed of none. The Supreme Court currently has one request for certification pending.

	<i>April 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Requests for Certification filed	1	3
<i>Civil Cases</i>	1	2
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	1
Requests for Certification dispositions	0	2
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	1 (1)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	1 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, three matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) was filed and no cases were reopened. The Supreme Court received 12 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 24 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. Four original actions were filed in April.

	<i>April 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Filings (including reopened cases)	20	82
Attorney disciplinary cases	3	22
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	2
Bar Admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	12	48
Other (including Original Actions)	4	10

	<i>April 2025</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Dispositions by Order (including reopened cases)	15	71
Attorney disciplinary cases	0	0
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Bar Admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	12	55
Other (Including Original Actions)	3	16

DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2025

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2021AP1525 (2025 WI 10)	<p><u>Hayden Halter v. Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association</u> The decision of the court of appeals is reversed. HAGEDORN, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET, KAROFISKY, PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. PROTASIEWICZ, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which KAROFISKY, J., joined. ZIEGLER, C.J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., joined.</p>	04/08/2025
2023AP314-D (2025 WI 9)	<p><u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Lynne Layber</u> Per Curiam. Attorney disciplinary proceedings. Attorney is publicly reprimanded for professional misconduct.</p>	04/08/2025
2022AP1158 (2025 WI 11)	<p><u>Oconomowoc Area School District v. Gregory L. Cota</u> The decision of the court of appeals is reversed. DALLET, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, HAGEDORN, KAROFISKY, and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. PROTASIEWICZ, J., filed a concurring opinion. ZIEGLER, C.J., filed a dissenting opinion. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., joined.</p>	04/10/2025
2020AP1624-D (2025 WI 13)	<p><u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Carl Robert Scholz</u> Per Cuiam. Attorney disciplinary proceedings. Attorney’s license is revoked. ZIELGER, C.J., REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, HAGEDORN, and KAROFISKY, JJ., join, concurring.</p>	04/18/2025

2024AP729-OA
(2025 WI 12)

Jeffery A. LeMieux v. Tony Evers
Relief denied.

04/18/2025

KAROFKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court with respect to ¶¶1–19 and 25–31, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET, and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined, and an opinion with respect to ¶¶20–24, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion. HAGEDORN, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., joined.