



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

JULY 2018

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of July 2018 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2017.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 10 cases in July. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>June 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	7	162
Attorney disciplinary cases	2	42
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	2
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	5	56
Criminal cases	2	27

Petitions for Review

A total of 56 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 July, the Supreme Court disposed of 66 petitions for review, of which 6 petition were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 199 petitions for review pending.

	<u>July 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	56	676
Civil cases	14	288
Criminal cases	42	385

Petition for Review dispositions	72	695
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	37 (4)	331 (34)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	35 (2)	391 (14)

Petitions for Bypass

In June, 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 no petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>July 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	0	14
Civil cases	0	7
Criminal cases	0	7
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	0	16
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	8 (2)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	8 (3)

Requests for Certification

During July 2018, the Supreme Court received 1 requests for certification and disposed of 1 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 1 requests for certification pending.

	<u>July 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	1	<u>7</u>
Civil cases	0	4
Criminal cases	1	3
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	5 (4)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	1 (1)	5 (5)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 5 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 6 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original action was 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 13 regulatory matters and 10 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>June 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	58
Judicial discipline.....	0	2
Bar admission.....	0	2
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	6	41
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	5
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	2	6
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	0	41
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	7

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING JULY 2018**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2016AP2483-CR	State v. Patrick H. Dalton Court of Appeals decision reversed and cause remanded to the circuit court <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Bradley, A.W., J <u>Dissent:</u> Roggensack, C.J. and Gableman, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Ziegler, J. and Gableman, J.	07/03/2018
2015AP00304-CR	State v. Gerald P. Mitchell The Judgment of the Circuit Court is Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Roggensack, C.J. <u>Concur:</u> Kelly, J. and Bradley, R.G., J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, A.W., J. and Abrahamson, J.	07/03/2018
2015AP2375	Milwaukee Police Association v. City of Milwaukee Court of Appeals reversed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Roggensack, C.J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Bradley, R. G., J and Gableman, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Abrahamson, J., and Bradley, A.W., J. <u>Dissent:</u> Kelly, J.	07/06/2018
2017AP1240	John McAdams v. Marquette University – Judgment and Order of the Circuit Court are reversed and cause remanded with Instructions. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Kelly, J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Bradley, R.G., J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Kelly, J., and Bradley. R.G., J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, A. W., J. and Abrahamson, J. <u>Not participating:</u> Ziegler, A., J.	07/6/2018

2016AP2455-CR	State v. Christopher John Kerr Order of the Circuit Court is reversed and the cause Remanded. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Ziegler, J. <u>Concur:</u> Ziegler, J., Roggensack, C.J., Gableman, J., and Kelly, J., (joining footnote 2) <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, A.W., J., and Abrahamson, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, R. G., J.	07/06/2018
2018AP474-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation v. James Eric Goldmann. License Revoked. Pay Restitution Per Curiam ¹	07/13/2018
2018AP810-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Stephanie C. Stoltman. Public Reprimand, reciprocal discipline with the State of Arizona, (LOMAP and Costs) and costs, Probation Per Curiam	07/24/2018

¹ “Per Curiam” means “by the court.” Opinions issued per curiam are handed down by the court as a whole.