



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Annette Kingsland Ziegler
Chief Justice

Sheila T. Reiff
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

APRIL 2023

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of April, 2023 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2022.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 8 cases in April. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>April 2023</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	8	37
Attorney disciplinary cases	1	8
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	6	21
Criminal cases	1	8

Petitions for Review

A total of 57 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 April, the Supreme Court disposed of 48 petitions for review, of which 2 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 145 petitions for review pending.

	<u>April 2023</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	57	365
Civil cases	18	157
Criminal cases.....	39	208

Petition for Review dispositions	48	386
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	23 (1)	176 (11)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	25 (1)	210 (7)

Petitions for Bypass

In April, the Supreme Court received 6 petitions for bypass and disposed of no petitions 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 7 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>April 2023</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	6	16
Civil cases	4	13
Criminal cases	2	3
 Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	 0	 11
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	10 (2)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During April 2023, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of no 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 no requests for certification pending.

	<u>April 2023</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	0	<u>1</u>
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	0	1
 Request for Certification dispositions.....	 <u>0</u>	 <u>2</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	2 (2)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of no matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) was filed and one such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 3 petitions for supervisory writ, which asks the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a Circuit Court to take a certain action in a case. There were no original actions 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 58 regulatory matters and 5 petitions for supervisory writs pending.

	<u>April 2023</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	1	11
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	3	38
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	1
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	4
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	3	54
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	5

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2023**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2020AP1582	<p><u>Beatriz Banuelos v. University of Wisconsin Hospitals and Clinics Authority</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which DALLET, HAGEDORN, and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. ROGGENSACK, J., filed a dissenting opinion. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and ROGGENSACK, J., joined.</p>	04/04/2023
#2020AP1362-CR	<p><u>State V. Jovan T. Mull</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED. ROGGENSACK, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, HAGEDORN, and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. DALLET, J., filed a dissenting opinion.</p>	04/04/2023

#2020AP225

Louis Pagoudis v. Marcus Keidl

04/04/2023

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART, AND THE CAUSE IS REMANDED TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS CONSISTENT WITH THIS OPINION.

KAROFSKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, **ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET**, and **HAGEDORN, JJ.**, joined. **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, filed a concurring opinion, in which **HAGEDORN, J.**, joined. **ROGGENSACK, J.**, filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part. **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part.

#2020AP189

ACUITY v. Estate of Michael Shimeta

04/07/2023

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.

KAROFSKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which **ANN WALSH BRADLEY, ROGGENSACK**, and **DALLET, JJ.**, joined. **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, filed a dissenting opinion, in which **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, joined. **HAGEDORN, J.**, filed a dissenting opinion, in which **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, joined.

#2020AP2146

DEKK Property Development, LLC v. Wisconsin Department of Transportation

04/18/2023

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS MODIFIED, AND AS MODIFIED, AFFIRMED.

KAROFSKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, **ANN WALSH BRADLEY, ROGGENSACK, DALLET** and **HAGEDORN, JJ.**, joined. **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, filed a concurring opinion.

#2022AP1916-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Kevin R. Rosin

04/25/2023

PER CURIAM.

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Kevin R. Rosin to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of one year, effective May 25, 2023.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Kevin R. Rosin shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 concerning the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin has been suspended. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that compliance with all conditions of this order is required for reinstatement. See SCR 22.28(3).

#2021AP102

Green Bay Professional Police Association v. City of Green Bay

04/27/2023

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.

KAROFSKY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, **ANN WALSH BRADLEY**, **ROGGENSACK**, **DALLET**, **HAGEDORN, JJ.**, joined. **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, filed a concurring opinion. **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, filed a concurring opinion.

#2020AP1454

Neil J. Rennick v. Teleflex Medical Incorporated

04/28/2023

PER CURIAM.

The court is evenly divided on whether to affirm or reverse the court of appeals' decision in *Rennick v. Teleflex Med. Inc.*, No. 2018CV3317, unpublished slip op. (Wis. Ct. App. Apr. 5, 2022) (per curiam).

Accordingly, the decision of the court of appeals is affirmed.

REBECCA FRANK DALLET, J., did not participate.