



# 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

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

J. Denis Moran  
Director of State Courts

Diane M. Fremgen  
Clerk of Supreme Court

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### February 2017

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of February 2017 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2016.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

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

	<u>February 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>10</u>	<u>28</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	5	18
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar admission cases.....	0	0
Civil cases .....	1	4
Criminal cases .....	4	6

#### Petitions for Review

A total of 45 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 February, the Supreme Court disposed of 66 petitions for review, of which 5 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 148 petitions for review pending.

	<u>February 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	<u>45</u>	<u>316</u>
Civil cases .....	17	149
Criminal cases .....	28	167

Petition for Review dispositions .....	<u>66</u>	<u>400</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	28 (5)	190 (19)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	38 (0)	210 (19)

Petitions for Bypass

In February, the Supreme Court received 1 petition for bypass and disposed of 0 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 1 petition for bypass pending.

	<u>February 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases .....	1	2
Criminal cases .....	0	0
 Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	3 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	0 (0)

Requests for Certification

During February 2017, the Supreme Court received 0 requests for certification and disposed of 0 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>February 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed .....	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases .....	0	1
Criminal cases .....	0	1
 Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Civil cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	2 (1)
Criminal cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	1 (0)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 3 matter 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 1 petition 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 actions were 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 31 regulatory matters and 6 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>February 2017</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	31
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	1	23
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	0
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	2
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	3	22
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	2

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

**OPINIONS ISSUED DURING February 2017**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2016AP684-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. David A. Lemanski Public Reprimand Per Curiam <sup>1</sup>	02/01/2017
2016AP1400-D	OLR v. Melinda R. Alfredson License Suspension Per Curiam	02/01/2017
2007AP776-D	OLR v. Godfrey Y. Muwonge Conditions Imposed Per Curiam	02/17/2017
2015AP1971-D	OLR v. Thad M. Gegner License Revoked Per Curiam	02/17/2017
2016AP2014-D	OLR v. David J. Silberman License Revoked Per Curiam	02/17/2017

**CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2014AP2840-CR	State v. Christopher Joseph Allen Court of Appeals decision affirmed <u>Majority Opinion:</u> A.W. Bradley, J. <u>Concur:</u> Abrahamson, J.	02/09/2017
2015AP158-CR	State v. Rozerick E. Mattox Judgment of circuit court affirmed <u>Majority Opinion:</u> R.G. Bradley, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Abrahamson, J. joined by A.W. Bradley, J.	02/14/2017

---

<sup>1</sup> “Per Curiam” means “by the Court.” Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

2014AP2981-CR	State v. Tabitha A. Scruggs Court of Appeals decision affirmed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J.	02/23/2017
2015AP1152	Voces de la Frontera, Inc. v. David A. Clarke, Jr. Court of Appeals decision reversed; writ of mandamus is quashed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C.J. <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, J. Ziegler, J. did not participate.	02/24/2017
2015AP202-CR	State v. Jeffrey C. Denny Court of Appeals decision reversed <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Concur/Dissent</u> : Roggensack, C.J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. <u>Dissent</u> : A.W. Bradley, joined by Abrahamson, J.	02/28/2017