



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

JANUARY 2021

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of January 2021 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2020.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 7 cases in January. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>January 2021</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>7</u>	<u>28</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	3	18
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	1	4
Criminal cases	3	6

Petitions for Review

A total of 54 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 January, the Supreme Court disposed of 52 petitions for review, of which 6 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 202 petitions for review pending.

	<u>January 2021</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	54	257
Civil cases	30	97
Criminal cases	24	160

Petition for Review dispositions	52	221
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	15 (1)	87 (9)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	37 (5)	134 (13)

Petitions for Bypass

In January, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of one petition 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 January 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>January 2021</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	0	7
Civil cases	0	2
Criminal cases	0	5
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	1	8
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	3 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	1 (0)	5 (1)

Requests for Certification

During January 2021, 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>January 2021</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	0	<u>2</u>
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	0	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (3)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of one matter within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) was filed and 4 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 was 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 105 regulatory matters and 9 petitions for supervisory writs pending.

	<u>January 2021</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	5	15
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	2
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	2	16
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	15
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	0
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	5	18
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	12

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING JANUARY 2021**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2018AP594-CR	State v. Leevan Roundtree AFFIRMED. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ROGGENSACK, C. J., ZIEGLER, DALLET, and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a dissenting opinion. HAGEDORN, J., filed a dissenting opinion.	01/07/2021
#2018AP2419-CR	State v. Angel Mercado THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED. ROGGENSACK, C. J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.	01/20/2021
#2014AP2633-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation v. William J. Spangler PER CURIAM. IT IS ORDERED that the license of William J. Spangler to practice law in Wisconsin is reinstated, effective the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order, William J. Spangler shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are \$3,973.88 as of October 27, 2020.	01/26/2021

#2018AP540-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Beth M. Bant
PER CURIAM.

01/26/2021

IT IS ORDERED that the license of Beth M. Bant to practice law in Wisconsin is reinstated, effective the date of this order. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, Beth M. Bant shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are \$4,149.29 as of November 24, 2020.

#2018AP547

Michael Anderson v. Town of Newbold
THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.

01/27/2021

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

#2014AP1651-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. David G. Dudas
PER CURIAM.

01/27/2021

IT IS ORDERED that the license of David G. Dudas to practice law in Wisconsin is revoked, retroactive to May 21, 2014. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, to the extent he has not already done so, David G. Dudas shall comply with the provisions of SCR 22.26 concerning the duties of a person whose license to practice law in Wisconsin has been revoked.

#2018AP858-CR

State v. Brian L. Halverson

01/29/2021

THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED, AND THE CAUSE IS REMANDED TO THE CIRCUIT COURT WITH DIRECTIONS.

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

REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ZIEGLER, J., joined. DALLET, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined.