



Jill J. Karofsky  
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

Samuel A. Christensen  
Clerk of Supreme Court

[CLERK@WICOURTS.GOV](mailto:CLERK@WICOURTS.GOV)

[WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM](http://WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM)

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### FEBRUARY 2026

This statistical report provides an overview of case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court for the month of February and for the term that began on September 1, 2025.

#### OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

The Supreme Court issued two 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 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Total number of cases resolved by opinion</i>	2	9
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	0	6
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admissions</i>	0	0
<i>Civil Cases</i>	0	0
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	2	3

#### 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, 42 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 49 petitions for review during the month, one of which was granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 374 petitions for review that are still pending.

	<i>February 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Petitions for Review filed</i>	42	295
<i>Civil Cases</i>	22	134
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	20	161
<i>Petitions for Review dispositions</i>	49	177
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	30 (1)	83 (7)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	19 (0)	94 (2)

PETITIONS FOR BYPASS

A petition for bypass is a request for the Supreme Court to assume jurisdiction over an appeal other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court can grant such a petition if the case meets one or more criteria for review, or if there is a compelling need to expedite the appellate process. When a bypass is granted, the Supreme Court will decide the matter directly, regardless of any potential decision by the Court of Appeals.

In February, the Supreme Court received two petitions for bypass and disposed of two petitions. The Supreme Court currently has five petitions for bypass pending.

	<i>February 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Petitions for Bypass filed</i>	2	6
<i>Civil Cases</i>	2	5
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	1
<i>Petitions for Bypass dispositions</i>	2	4
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	1 (0)	3 (0)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	1 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

A request for certification arises when the Court of Appeals asks 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 no requests for certification pending.

	<i>February 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Requests for Certification filed</i>	0	0
<i>Civil Cases</i>	0	0
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	0
<i>Requests for Certification dispositions</i>	0	1
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	1 (1)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, one matter within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) was filed and cases were reopened. The Supreme Court received ten 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 20 regulatory matters and 31 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. One original action was filed in February.

	<i>February 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Total number of Filings (including reopened cases)</i>	12	75
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	1	14
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	0
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	10	54
<i>Other (including Original Actions)</i>	1	7
	<i>February 2026</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
<i>Total number of Dispositions by Order (including reopened cases)</i>	11	61
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	0	1
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	1
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	9	53
<i>Other (Including Original Actions)</i>	2	6

DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT  
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING FEBRUARY 2026

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2023AP715-CR <a href="#">(2026 WI 5)</a>	<b><u>State v. J.D.B.</u></b> <b>The decision of the court of appeals is reversed.</b> BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which JILL J. KAROFSKY, C.J., and ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, REBECCA FRANK DALLET, and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, J., filed a dissenting opinion.	02/25/2026
2024AP649-CR <a href="#">(2026 WI 4)</a>	<b><u>State v. Andreas W. Rauch Sharak</u></b> <b>The judgment of the circuit court is affirmed.</b> JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.	02/24/2026