



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Patience Drake Roggensack
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 2020

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of April 2020 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2019.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 10 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 2020</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	10	52
Attorney disciplinary cases	4	20
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	1
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	4	35
Criminal cases	2	17

Petitions for Review

A total of 32 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 3 petitions for review, of which 1 petition was granted. The Supreme Court currently has 184 petitions for review pending.

	<u>April 2020</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	32	367
Civil cases	11	107
Criminal cases.....	21	260

Petition for Review dispositions	3	334
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	2 (1)	103 (14)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	1 (0)	231 (13)

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 2 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>April 2020</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	10
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	9 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During April 2020, 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 2020</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	0	<u>0</u>
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	0	0
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 3 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 2 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 5 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 3 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 103 regulatory matters and 13 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>April 2020</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	28
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	5	31
Other (including Original Actions).....	3	5
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	2
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	0	23
Other (including Original Actions).....	5	11

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING APRIL 2020**

Docket No.

Title

Date

#2018AP2416-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Jesse Jon

Johansen:

Per Curiam

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Jesse J. Johansen to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of six months, effective the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order, Jesse J. Johansen shall pay restitution as follows: \$250 to Attorney Richard Gondik; \$1,500 to the Wisconsin Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection in the J.J. matter; \$2,000 to E.V.; and \$900 to L.G. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order, Jesse J. Johansen shall pay the Office of Lawyer Regulation, the costs of this proceeding, which are \$5,253.95 as of December 23, 2019. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that restitution specified above is to be completed prior to paying costs to the Office of Lawyer Regulation. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that to the extent that he has not already done so, Jesse J. Johansen shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 regarding the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin has been suspended. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the temporary suspension of Jesse J. Johansen's license to practice law, entered on October 9, 2018, is hereby lifted.

04/09/2020

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative suspension of Jesse J. Johansen's license to practice law in Wisconsin, due to his failure to pay mandatory bar dues, for failure to file Office of Lawyer Regulation trust account certification, and for noncompliance with continuing education requirements, will remain in effect until each reason for the administrative suspension has been rectified pursuant to SCR 22.28(1). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that compliance with all conditions of this order is required for reinstatement. See SCR 22.28(3).

#2019AP1771-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Willem James Noorlander

04/09/2020

PER CURIAM

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Willem James Noorlander to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of 60 days, effective the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Willem James Noorlander 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(2).

KELLY, J., did not participate.

#2016AP1982

Winnebago County v. C.S.

04/10/2020

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

Ziegler, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which Ann Walsh Bradley, Kelly an Dallet., JJ., joined. Rebecca Grassl Bradley, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which Roggensack, C.J. joined.

#2018AP715-FT

Joan C. Pulkkila v. James M. Pulkkila

04/14/2020

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

Ann Walsh Bradley, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which Roggensack, C. J., Ziegler, and Kelly, JJ., joined. Rebecca Grassl Bradley, J., filed a dissenting opinion. Dallet and Hagedorn, JJ., did not participate.

#2019AP1173-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Patrick J. Hudec.

04/16/2020

PER CURIAM

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Patrick J. Hudec to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of 60 days, effective May 28, 2020. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if he has not already done so, Patrick J. Hudec shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 regarding the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin has been suspended. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that as a condition of his license to practice law

in Wisconsin, Patrick J. Hudec shall attend and successfully complete an Office of Lawyer Regulation trust account seminar within one year of the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Patrick J. Hudec fails to timely complete the requirement that he attend an Office of Lawyer Regulation trust account seminar, the Office of Lawyer Regulation is directed to inform this court promptly and Patrick J. Hudec's law license may be subject to immediate suspension. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order, Patrick J. Hudec shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are \$3,991.10 as of January 29, 2020.

#2017AP2440-CR
#2017AP2441-CR

State v. Richard H. Harrison, Jr.
THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED.
Roggensack, C.J. delivered the majority opinion of the Court in which Ziegler, Rebecca Grassl Bradley, Kelly and Hagedorn, JJ., joined. Dallet, J. filed a concurring opinion in which Ann Walsh Bradley, J., joined.

04/17/2020

#18AP1781-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Robert B. Moodie
PER CURIAM
IT IS ORDERED that the license of Robert B. Moodie to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of six months, effective June 3, 2020. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order, Robert B. Moodie shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are \$6,081.63 as of January 15, 2020. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, to the extent that he has not already done so, Robert B. Moodie 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

04/22/2020

compliance with all conditions with this order is required for reinstatement. See SCR 22.29(4)(c).

Ziegler, J., filed a dissenting opinion in which Roggensack, C.J. joined.

Ann Walsh Bradley, J. did not participate.

#2018AP145-FT

Langlade County v. D.J.W.

04/24/2020

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED.

Ann Walsh Bradley, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which Ziegler, Kelly, Dallet, and Hagedorn, JJ., joined. Rebecca Grassl Bradley J., filed a dissenting opinion.

#2017AP1616

London Scott Barney v. Julie Mickelson, MD

04/24/2020

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED.

Dallet, J. delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.