



Annette Kingsland Ziegler
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

WWW.WICOURTS.GOV/COURTS/OFFICES/CLERK.HTM

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

APRIL 2024

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

OPINIONS ISSUED BY THE COURT

The Supreme Court issued 3 opinions resolving 3 cases in April. Information about these opinions, including the Court's disposition and the names of the authoring justices, can be found in the attached table.

	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	3	19
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	1	11
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Civil Cases</i>	2	7
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	1

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 the month of April, a total of 44 new petitions for review were filed. In addition, the Supreme Court disposed of 39 petitions for review during the month, one of which was granted. At present, the Supreme Court has 178 petitions for review that are still pending.

	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Petitions for Review filed	44	376
<i>Civil Cases</i>	22	197
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	22	179
Petitions for Review dispositions	39	407
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	21 (1)	177 (5)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	18 (0)	230 (3)

PETITIONS FOR BYPASS

A petition for bypass is a request made by a party to the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding that is pending in the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court may consider a case appropriate for bypass if it meets one or more of the criteria for review. In such cases, the Supreme Court will ultimately decide to consider the matter, regardless of how the Court of Appeals may decide the issues. This type of petition may also be granted where there is a clear need to speed up the ultimate appellate decision. In April, the Supreme Court received 6 petitions for bypass and disposed of 5 petitions. The Supreme Court currently has 8 petitions for bypass pending.

	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Petitions for Bypass filed	6	18
<i>Civil Cases</i>	6	16
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	2
Petitions for Bypass dispositions	5	15
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	5 (0)	13 (1)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	2 (0)

Requests for Certification

A request for certification arises when the Court of Appeals calls upon 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 April, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of no requests for certification. The Supreme Court currently has no requests for certification pending.

	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Requests for Certification filed	0	0
<i>Civil Cases</i>	0	0
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	0	0
Requests for Certification dispositions	0	0
<i>Civil Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>Criminal Cases (petitions granted)</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 1 matter within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) was filed and 1 such cases was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 3 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 19 regulatory matters and 10 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.

	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Filings <i>(including reopened cases)</i>	8	58
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	1	16
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	0
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	5	34
<i>Other (including Original Actions)</i>	2	8
	<i>April 2024</i>	<i>Term to Date</i>
Total number of Dispositions by Order <i>(including reopened cases)</i>	6	37
<i>Attorney disciplinary cases</i>	0	1
<i>Judicial disciplinary cases</i>	0	0
<i>Bar Admission</i>	0	0
<i>Petitions for Supervisory Writ</i>	5	31
<i>Other (Including Original Actions)</i>	1	5

DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2024

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2020AP333	<u>Erik A. Andrade v. City of Milwaukee Board of Fire and Police Commissioners</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED. HAGEDORN, J. delivered the majority opinion of the Court in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET, KAROFSKY, and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ. joined. ZIEGLER, C.J. filed a dissenting opinion, in which REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., joined.	04-30-2024
2022AP35-D	<u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Roger G. Merry</u> PER CURIAM. Attorney's license revoked. ZIEGLER, C.J., filed a concurring opinion, in which, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, HAGEDORN, KAROFSKY, and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined.	04-24-2024
2022AP1334	<u>A.M.B. v. Circuit Court for Ashland County</u> THE DECISION OF THE CIRCUIT COURT IS AFFIRMED. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and HAGEDORN, J., joined. DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, and PROTASIEWICZ, JJ., joined. KAROFSKY, J., filed a concurring opinion.	04-30-2024