

August 29, 2024

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT

TABLE OF PENDING CASES

Clerk of Supreme Court
Telephone: (608) 266-1880
Email: clerk@wicourts.gov
Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

Wisconsin Supreme Court Case Access: <http://wscca.wicourts.gov>

The following table describes pending cases the Supreme Court has accepted on petition for review, bypass, certification and original jurisdiction.

The cases included for the first time (that is, the most recently accepted cases) are marked with an * next to the case number. After the Supreme Court decides a case, the date of oral argument or date of submission on briefs is replaced with the date of the Supreme Court decision and abbreviated mandate. That mandate will generally be listed in the table for two months and then the case will be removed from the table.

The information in the table, from left to right, is as follows:

- the case number;
- an abbreviated caption of the case (case name);
- a statement of the issue(s);
- the date the Supreme Court accepted the case;
- the method by which the case came to the Supreme Court: REVW = Petition for review, CERT = Certification, CERQ = Certified Question, BYPA = Petition to bypass, ORIG = Original Action, WRIT = Petition for supervisory writ, REMD = Remanded from the U.S. Supreme Court;
- the date of oral argument or submission on briefs; or the date of the Supreme Court decision and an abbreviated mandate;
- the Court of Appeals district from which the case came, if applicable; the county;
- the date of the Court of Appeals decision, if applicable;
- whether the Court of Appeals decision is published or unpublished, and, if it is published, the citations to the public domain citation and the official reports for the Court of Appeals decision.

The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.

The following table covers cases accepted and decisions issued through **August 29, 2024**. Please direct any comments regarding this table to the Clerk of Supreme Court via email to Clerk@WICourts.gov.

TABLE OF PENDING CASES
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
 CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

Case No.	Caption/Issue(s)	SC Accepted/ Oral Arg. or Brief Subm.	CA Dist./ Cty.	CA Decision
2021AP001525	<u>Hayden Halter v. Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association</u> Is the WIAA a state actor? Are the Halters entitled to judicial review of the WIAA's decision to suspend Hayden Halter from the 2019 varsity wrestling regional event and to deny him an internal appeal to the body's Board of Control? Are the Halters entitled to certiorari relief? Are the Halters entitled to declaratory relief reinstating Hayden Halter's 2019 state title and points? Are the Halters entitled to a permanent injunction?	08/02/2022 REVW Oral Arg.: 10/09/2024	2 Racine	02/28/2023 Pub. 2024 WI App 12
2022AP1158	<u>Oconomowoc Area School District v. Cota</u> Does information indicating that an individual has been questioned, apprehended, taken into custody or detention, held for investigation, arrested, charged with, indicted or tried pursuant to law enforcement authority, for a municipal offense punishable by a forfeiture, constitute an "arrest record" within the meaning of the Wisconsin Fair Employment Act ("the WFEA") and does the WFEA therefore provide protection against terminations that are based upon this information? If the Court agrees on the first issue presented, a secondary issue is presented as to whether substantial evidence in the record supports the factual finding of the LIRC that the decision of the Oconomowoc Area School District to terminate the employment of Jeffrey Cota and Gregory Cota was made on the basis of their arrest records in violation of the WFEA. Did the LIRC and the trial court correctly determine that a municipal citation was an arrest record as defined by Wis. Stat. § 11.32(1), and therefore firing the Cotas because of information indicating the Cotas had been issued a municipal citation was arrest record discrimination?	06/17/2024 REVW Oral Arg.: 09/10/2024	2 Waukesha	01/10/2024 Pub. 2024 WI App 8
2023AP36	<u>Wisconsin Voter Alliance v. Secord</u> Whether the Court of Appeals was bound to apply its own precedent established in <i>Wisconsin Voter Alliance v. Reynolds</i> , 2022 WI App 66 , 410 Wis. 2d 335, 1 N.W.3d 748? Whether the Notices of Voting Eligibility forms are subject to public disclosure?	12/27/2023 REVW Oral Arg.: 09/10/2024	2 Walworth	12/22/2023 Unpub.

NOTE: The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.

TABLE OF PENDING CASES
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
 CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

Case No.	Caption/Issue(s)	SC Accepted/ Oral Arg. or Brief Subm.	CA Dist./ Cty.	CA Decision
2023AP533	<u>Waukesha County v. M.A.C.</u> Under what circumstances can a default judgment be entered against an individual who appears by counsel at a commitment hearing? Whether Wis. Stat. § 51.20(10)(a) entitles an individual to personal notice of a recommitment hearing. Whether a person can forfeit their right to an examination of their competency to refuse medication.	12/12/2023 REVW REVERSED 07/05/2024 2024 WI 30	2 Waukesha	08/30/2023 Unpub.
2023AP1072	<u>Douglas County v. K.A.D.</u> Should this court overrule [Outagamie County v. L.X.D.-O, 2023 WI App 17, 407 Wis. 2d 441, 991 N.W.1d 518]? Whether the County presented sufficient evidence under Wis. Stat. § 51.61(1)(g)4 to establish that K.A.D. was incompetent to refuse medication?	06/17/2024 REVW DISMISSED 08/29/2024	3 Douglas	02/13/2024 Unpub.
2023AP1399-OA	<u>Rebecca Clarke v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</u> Do the existing state legislative maps violate the contiguity requirements contained in Article IV, Sections 4 and 5 of the Wisconsin Constitution? Did the adoption of the existing state legislative maps violate the Wisconsin Constitution's separation of powers? If the court rules that Wisconsin's existing state legislative maps violate the Wisconsin Constitution for either or both of these reasons and the legislature and the governor then fail to adopt state legislative maps that comply with the Wisconsin Constitution, what standards should guide the court in imposing a remedy for the constitutional violation(s)? What fact-finding, if any, will be required if the court determines there is a constitutional violation based on the contiguity clauses and/or the separation-of-powers doctrine and the court is required to craft a remedy for the violation? If fact-finding will be required, what process should be used to resolve questions of fact?	10/06/2023 ORIG Oral Arg.: 11/21/2023	--	--
2023AP1614	<u>Morway v. Morway</u> Is an order that includes no finality language and that expressly contemplates additional substantive litigation between the parties a "final order" under Wis. Stat. § 808.03(1) for purposes of appeal? Is there an attorney fee exception to finality under Wis. Stat. § 808.03(1) , such that an order is final for purposes of appeal if all that remains to be litigated is a claim for attorney's fees? If an attorney fee exception exists, does it extend to fee claims that require additional substantive litigation between the parties?	04/16/2024 REVW Oral Arg.: 09/23/2024	2 Ozaukee	11/17/2023 Unpub.

NOTE: The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.

TABLE OF PENDING CASES
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
 CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

Case No.	Caption/Issue(s)	SC Accepted/ Oral Arg. or Brief Subm.	CA Dist./ Cty.	CA Decision
2023AP2020-OA	<u>Governor Evers v. Senator Marklein</u> Wisconsin Stat. § 23.0917 charges DNR with administering the Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Program, through which DNR awards already-appropriated funds to expand public access to the State's natural resources. Wisconsin Stat. § 23.0917(6m) and (8)(g)3. authorize the Joint Committee on Finance, a 16-member legislative committee, to veto DNR's choices. Do those veto provisions facially violate the separation of powers?	02/02/2024 ORIG DECISION 07/05/2024 2024 WI 31	--	--
2023AP2362	<u>Josh Kaul v. Joel Urmanski</u> Does § 940.04 , and § 940.04(1), (5), and (6) specifically, prohibit performing consensual abortions, subject to the exception in § 940.04(5)? If § 940.04 , and § 940.04(1), (5), and (6) in particular, otherwise would apply to and prohibit performing consensual abortions, subject to § 940.04(5), has that prohibition been impliedly repealed or superseded by subsequent legislation such that it can no longer be applied to consensual abortions? If § 940.04 , and § 940.04(1), (5), and (6) in particular, otherwise would apply to and prohibit performing consensual abortions, subject to § 940.04(5), is that prohibition unenforceable as to abortions under the Due Process Clause because it is unconstitutionally vague on its face or compliance is impossible? If § 940.04 , and § 940.04(1), (5), and (6) in particular, otherwise would apply to and prohibit performing consensual abortions, subject to § 940.04(5), is that prohibition unenforceable because of alleged disuse and reliance on <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and its progeny? Do the State Agencies have standing to bring their own claims in this action and, if not, can they rely on the standing of an intervenor to remain in the action and benefit from a judgment obtained by an intervenor?	07/02/2024 BYPA	4 DANE	--
2024AP164	<u>Priorities USA v. Wisconsin Election Commission</u> Whether to overrule the Court's holding in <u>Teigen v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</u> , 2022 WI 64 , 403 Wis. 2d 607, 976 N.W.2d 519, that Wis. Stat. § 6.87 precludes the use of secure drop boxes for the return of absentee ballots to municipal clerks.	03/12/2024 BYPA REVERSED 07/05/2024 2024 WI 32	4 Dane	--

NOTE: The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.

TABLE OF PENDING CASES
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
 CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

Case No.	Caption/Issue(s)	SC Accepted/ Oral Arg. or Brief Subm.	CA Dist./ Cty.	CA Decision
2024AP232	<p><u>Kenneth Brown v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</u></p> <p>Under Wis. Stat. § 6.855(1), municipalities may designate alternate voting sites for in-person absentee voting. A site may not afford an advantage to any political party. Wis. Stat. § 6.855(1). In response to a 2016 federal court ruling concluding that limiting municipalities to a single site could violate federal law, the Legislature passed Wis. Stat. § 6.855(5), which permits multiple sites. But the circuit court held that Racine erred in establishing such sites for the August 2022 primary election because its sites were located in wards with different Democratic/Republican voting results than the ward where the city clerk’s office is located. Did the circuit court correctly interpret the statute?</p> <p>This lawsuit was filed by a voter who filed an administrative complaint with the Commission under Wis. Stat. § 5.061 and then appealed after the Commission found no violation of law. The plaintiff asserted that he is a voter who wants to see the law followed. He did not assert that his ability to vote had been injured or that he belongs to a political party that was injured. The circuit court held that the <i>Teigen v. WEC</i>, 2022 WI 64, 403 Wis. 2d 607, 976 N.W.2d 519. Was the plaintiff “aggrieved” under Wisconsin law?</p> <p>For the August 2022 primary election, Racine parked a mobile voting unit at the sites designated as alternate in-person absentee voting. The unit contained the voting equipment and other materials needed for voters to cast their votes. The circuit court held that this violated Wisconsin statutes. Was this a correct reading of Wisconsin law?</p>	<p>05/03/2024 BYPA Oral Arg.: 09/10/2024</p>	<p>2 Racine</p>	<p>--</p>

NOTE: The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.

TABLE OF PENDING CASES
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
 CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

Case No.	Caption/Issue(s)	SC Accepted/ Oral Arg. or Brief Subm.	CA Dist./ Cty.	CA Decision
2024AP330-OA	<p><u>Planned Parenthood of Wisconsin vs. Joel Urmanski</u></p> <p>Whether Wisconsin Statute § 940.04, if interpreted to prevent a person from obtaining an abortion in all circumstances except “to save the life of the mother,” violates the person’s inherent right to life and liberty guaranteed by Article I, Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, by unconstitutionally interfering with the person’s right to bodily integrity, autonomy, and self-determination—including the decision of whether and when to have a child.</p> <p>Whether Wisconsin Statute § 940.04, if interpreted to prevent a person from obtaining an abortion in all circumstances except “to save the life of the mother,” violates the person’s right to equal protection guaranteed by Article I, Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, by treating people, including those who seek abortion services, differently than people who seek comparable healthcare services, without an adequate state interest.</p> <p>Whether Wisconsin Statute § 940.04, if interpreted to prevent physicians from performing an abortion in all circumstances except “to save the life of the mother,” violates the physicians’ rights to equal protection guaranteed by Article I, Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, by treating physicians providing abortion services differently than those providing comparable healthcare services, without an adequate state interest.</p> <p>Whether Wisconsin Statute § 940.04, if interpreted to prevent physicians from performing an abortion in all circumstances except “to save the life of the mother,” infringes on the physicians’ fundamental right to liberty guaranteed by Article I, Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, by preventing them from practicing their chosen profession and treating their patients to the full extent of the physicians’ education, training, and ability, consistent with the patients’ needs.</p>	07/02/2024 ORIG	--	--
2024AP729-OA	<p><u>LeMieux v. Governor Evers</u></p> <p>Does Article V, § 10(1)(c) of the Wisconsin Constitution forbid a governor from deleting digits in an enrolled bill to create a new year?</p> <p>Does a governor exceed his or her partial-veto authority under Article V, § 10(1)(b) of the Wisconsin Constitution by deleting language in an enrolled bill to create a longer duration than the one that the legislature approved?</p>	06/17/2024 ORIG Oral Arg.: 10/09/2024	--	--

NOTE: The statement of the issue is cursory and does not purport to be an all-inclusive, precise statement of the issues in the case. Readers interested in a case should determine the precise nature of the issues from the record and briefs filed with the Supreme Court.