



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 2022

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of April, 2022 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2021.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 5 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 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>5</u>	<u>35</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	1	7
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	3	20
Criminal cases	1	8

Petitions for Review

A total of 41 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 59 petitions for review, of which 5 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 160 petitions for review pending.

	<u>April 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	41	382
Civil cases	16	165
Criminal cases	25	217

Petition for Review dispositions	59	444
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	29 (1)	188 (24)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	30 (4)	256 (17)

Petitions for Bypass

In April, the Supreme Court received no 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 3 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>April 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	0	9
Civil cases	0	8
Criminal cases	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	0	9
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	8 (5)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During April 2022, the Supreme Court received one request 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 one request for certification pending.

	<u>April 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	1	<u>4</u>
Civil cases	0	2
Criminal cases	1	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (2)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 2 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received no 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 104 regulatory matters and 10 petitions for supervisory writs pending.

	<u>April 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	2	12
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	4	30
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	3
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	1
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	7	34
Other (including Original Actions).....	2	3

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2022**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2020AP1271-AC	<u>James Sewell v. Racine Unified School District Board of Canvassers:</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED. ROGGANSACK, J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.	04/12/2022
#2019AP1618	<u>Nudo Holdings, LLC v. Board of Review for the City of Kenosha :</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, AND KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. ROGGENSACK, J. filed a dissenting opinion in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., joined.	04/12/2022
#2021AP1450-OA	<u>Billie Johnson v. Wisconsin Elections Commission:</u> RELIEF GRANTED. ZIEGLER, C.J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ROGGENSACK, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, and HAGEDORN, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and ROGGENSACK, J., joined. HAGEDORN, J., filed a concurring opinion. KAROFSKY, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY and DALLET, JJ., joined.	04/15/2022

#2021AP1996-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Scott D. Fisher:

04/19/2022

PER CURIAM.

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Scott D. Fisher to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for one year, effective the date of this order. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Scott D. Fisher 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).

#2020AP1058-CR

State v. Teresa L. Clark:

04/20/2022

REVERSED AND CAUSE REMANDED.

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