



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

MAY 2013

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of May 2013 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2012.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 11 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 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>11</u>	<u>61</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	8	40
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	1	11
Criminal cases	2	10

Petitions for Review

A total of 76 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 100 petitions for review, of which 5 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 317 petitions for review pending.

	<u>May 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>76</u>	<u>610</u>
Civil cases	37	281
Criminal cases	39	329

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>100</u>	<u>580</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	47 (5)	273 (23)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	53 (0)	307 (19)

Petitions for Bypass

In May, the Supreme Court received 0 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 0 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>May 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases	0	6
Criminal cases.....	0	3
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	12 (2)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	1 (0)	3 (0)

Requests for Certification

During May 2013, 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 3 requests for certification pending.

	<u>May 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Civil cases	0	3
Criminal cases.....	1	4
Request for Certification dispositions.....	0	<u>9</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	6 (4)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (3)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 4 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 11 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. One 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 37 regulatory matters and 18 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>May 2013</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	53
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	11	50
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	1
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	5
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	3	40
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	5

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING May 2013

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2009AP284-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Alan D. Eisenberg License Suspension Per Curiam ¹	05/02/2013
2007AP2763-D	OLR v. Barry LeSieur License Suspension Per Curiam	05/03/2013
2013AP133-D	OLR v. Jon E. Stanek License Suspension Per Curiam	05/16/2013
2010AP1118-D	OLR v. Stephen M. Compton License Reinstatement Per Curiam	05/17/2013
2012AP406-D	OLR v. William F. Mross License Suspension Per Curiam	05/17/2013
2013AP732-D	OLR v. Anne E. Brown License Revoked Per Curiam	05/17/2013
2013AP149-D	OLR v. Walter W. Stern, III License Suspended Per Curiam	05/21/2013
2002AP875-D	OLR v. Boris Ouchakof License Reinstatement Per Curiam	05/29/2013

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

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2011AP685-CR	State v. Lamont L. Travis Court of Appeals decision is affirmed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, CJ <u>Dissent</u> : Roggensack, J. Prosser, J. did not participate	05/02/2013
2011AP1240	Patricia A. Johnson v. Michael R. Masters Circuit Court decision reversed and remanded <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Crooks, J. <u>Concur</u> : Abrahamson, CJ <u>Concur</u> : Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, CJ <u>Concur</u> : Ziegler, J. joined by Roggensack, J. and Gableman, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Prosser, J.	05/17/2013
2010AP2003-CR	State v. Courtney C. Beamon Court of Appeals decision affirmed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, CJ Prosser, J. did not participate	05/29/2013