



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

### MAY 2026

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

#### OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

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

|  | <i>May 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>Total number of cases resolved by opinion</i> | 3               | 18                  |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>               | 2               | 10                  |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>               | 0               | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admissions</i>                            | 0               | 0                   |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                               | 0               | 5                   |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                            | 1               | 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 May, 56 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 58 petitions for review during the month, six of which was granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 417 petitions for review that are still pending.

|   | <i>May 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>Petitions for Review filed</i>         | 56              | 502                 |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                        | 30              | 231                 |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                     | 26              | 271                 |
| <i>Petitions for Review dispositions</i>  | 58              | 340                 |
| <i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>    | 22 (3)          | 160 (16)            |
| <i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i> | 36 (4)          | 180 (7)             |

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 May, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of one petition. The Supreme Court currently has one petition for bypass pending.

|   | <i>May 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>Petitions for Bypass filed</i>         | 0               | 9                   |
| <i>Civil Cases</i>                        | 0               | 7                   |
| <i>Criminal Cases</i>                     | 0               | 2                   |
| <i>Petitions for Bypass dispositions</i>  | 1               | 11                  |
| <i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>    | 0 (0)           | 8 (0)               |
| <i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i> | 1 (0)           | 3 (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 May, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of none. The Supreme Court currently has no requests for certification pending.

|  | <i>May 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, two 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 10 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 16 regulatory matters and 32 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 in May.

|   | <i>May 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>Total number of Filings<br/>(including reopened cases)</i>               | 12              | 103                 |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>  | 1               | 16                  |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>  | 0               | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admission</i>  | 1               | 1                   |
| <i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>                                       | 10              | 76                  |
| <i>Other (including Original Actions)</i>                                   | 0               | 10                  |
|   | <i>May 2026</i> | <i>Term to Date</i> |
| <i>Total number of Dispositions by Order<br/>(including reopened cases)</i> | 14              | 91                  |
| <i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>  | 4               | 6                   |
| <i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>  | 0               | 0                   |
| <i>Bar Admission</i>  | 0               | 1                   |
| <i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>                                       | 8               | 71                  |
| <i>Other (Including Original Actions)</i>                                   | 2               | 13                  |

DECISIONS BY THE  
**WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**  
 OPINIONS ISSUED DURING MAY 2026

| <u>Docket No.</u>                           | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Date</u> |
|---|---|-------------|
| 2024AP170-D<br><a href="#">(2026 WI 14)</a> | <u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Michael Seung-Hyock Yang</u><br><b>Per Curiam. Attorney's license is revoked.</b><br><br>ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., with whom JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., join, concurring.   | 05/01/2026  |
| 2024AP587-D<br><a href="#">(2026 WI 17)</a> | <u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Jerome J. Babiak</u><br><b>Per Curiam. Attorney's license is revoked.</b><br><br>ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, J., with whom JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, and JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., join, concurring.   | 05/29/2026  |
| 2024AP1195<br><a href="#">(2026 WI 16)</a>  | <u>Savannah Wren v. Columbia St. Mary's Hospital Milwaukee, Inc.</u><br><b>The decision of the court of appeals is affirmed.</b><br><br>JILL J. KAROFKY, C.J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ANNETTE KINGSLAND ZIEGLER, REBECCA FRANK DALLET, BRIAN K. HAGEDORN, JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion. REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined. JANET C. PROTASIEWICZ, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which REBECCA FRANK DALLET and SUSAN M. CRAWFORD, JJ., joined. | 05/19/2026  |