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

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2020

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

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 5 cases in September. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	September 2020	Term to Date
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	5	5
Attorney disciplinary cases	5	5
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	0	0

Petitions for Review

A total of 42 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 September, the Supreme Court disposed of 56 petitions for review, of which 8 petition was granted. The Supreme Court currently has 144 petitions for review pending.

	September 2020	Term to Date
Petitions for Review filed	42	42
Civil cases	12	12
Criminal cases	30	30

Petition for Review dispositions	64	64
Civil cases (petitions granted)	27 (4)	27 (4)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	37 (4)	37 (4)

Petitions for Bypass

In September, the Supreme Court received 2 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 September 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.

	September 2020	Term to Date
Petitions for Bypass filed	2	2
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	2	2
Petition for Bypass dispositions	0	0
Civil cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Requests for Certification

During September 2020, the Supreme Court received one request for certification and disposed of one request 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 2 requests for certification pending.

	September 2020	Term to Date
Requests for Certification filed	1	1
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	1	1
Request for Certification dispositions	0	1
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	1 (1)	1 (1)

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 no such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 2 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 one original action 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 101 regulatory matters and 12 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	September 2020	Term to Date
Filings		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases)	2	2
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	1	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	2	2
Other (including Original Actions)	1	1
Dispositions by Order		
Attorney discipline	0	0
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	4	4
Other (including Original Actions)	3	3

DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING SEPTEMBER 2020

Docket No.	Title	Date
#2019AP600-D	**Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Theodore F. Mazza** **PER CURIAM.** **IT IS ORDERED** that Theodore F. Mazza's petition for consensual license revocation is granted. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the license of Theodore F. Mazza to practice law in Wisconsin is revoked effective October 6, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, Theodore F. Mazza shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are $2,642.34 as of June 12, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, Theodore F. Mazza shall pay restitution as follows: • $19,001.97 to J.D.; • $600 to P.L.; and • $3,250 to S.P. **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 Theodore F. Mazza shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 concerning the duties of a person who is licensed to practice law in Wisconsin has been revoked.	09/01/2020

#2019AP1154-D **Office of Lawyer Regulation v. James T. Runyon** 09/09/2020

PER CURIAM.

IT IS ORDERED that the license of James T. Runyon to practice law in Wisconsin is revoked, effective the date of this order. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, James T. Runyon shall pay restitution of $135,785.42 to the P.A.T. Trust. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, James T. Runyon shall pay restitution to the Wisconsin Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection in the amount of $10,000 for the claims of S.S. and G.G.; $1,612.89 for M.B.'s claim; and $1,835 for R.G.'s claim. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, James T. Runyon shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are $1,080.34 as of June 26, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that payment of restitution is to be completed prior to paying costs to the Office of Lawyer Regulation. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that James T. Runyon shall comply, if he has not already done so, with the requirements of SCR 22.26 pertaining to the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin has been revoked.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that James T. Runyon's petition for voluntary resignation of his law license, which was held in abeyance pending consideration of this disciplinary proceeding, is dismissed as moot.

Ann Walsh Bradley, J. did not participate.

2019AP1696-D	**Office of Lawyer Regulation vs. Jean M. Robinson** **PER CURIAM.** **IT IS ORDERED** that the license of Jean M. Robinson to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of 18 months, effective June 3, 2019. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Jean M. Robinson 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).	09/29/2020
#2020AP724-D	**Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Coral Dawn Pleas** **PER CURIAM.** **IT IS ORDERED** that the license of Coral Dawn Pleas to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of six months, effective November 10, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, Coral Dawn Pleas shall make restitution to UnitedHealthcare in the amount of $8,333.33**. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Coral Dawn Pleas shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 concerning the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin have been suspended**. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that compliance with all conditions of this order is required for reinstatement. See SCR 22.29(4)(c).	09/29/2020

#2020AP762-D **Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Guy Norman Maras** 09/30/2020

PER CURIAM.

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Guy Norman Maras to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of six months, effective November 11, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Guy Norman Maras shall comply with all of the terms and conditions set forth in the Supreme Court of Illinois order dated January 17, 2020. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Guy Norman Maras 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 from the disciplinary suspension imposed herein.