



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Annette Kingsland Ziegler
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

MAY 2022

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of May, 2022 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2021.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 8 cases in May. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>May 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>8</u>	<u>43</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	3	10
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	2	22
Criminal cases	3	11

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 May, the Supreme Court disposed of 70 petitions for review, of which 5 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 131 petitions for review pending.

	<u>May 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	42	424
Civil cases	15	180
Criminal cases	27	244

Petition for Review dispositions	70	514
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	36 (4)	224 (28)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	34 (1)	290 (18)

Petitions for Bypass

In May, 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 3 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>May 2022</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	9
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	8 (5)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During May 2022, the Supreme Court received no requests 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 no requests for certification pending.

	<u>May 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	0	<u>4</u>
Civil cases	0	2
Criminal cases	0	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	3 (2)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	1 (1)	1 (2)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 2 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 7 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 107 regulatory matters and 15 petitions for supervisory writs pending.

	<u>May 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	2	14
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	7	38
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	4
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	1
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	2	36
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	3

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING MAY 2022**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2020AP202	<u>Estate of Anne Oros v. Divine Savior Healthcare Inc.:</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED. ZIEGLER, C.J. , delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.	05/06/2022
#2020AP724-D	<u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Coral Dawn Pleas:</u> PER CURIAM. IT IS ORDERED that the petition for reinstatement of Coral Dawn Pleas to practice law in Wisconsin is granted, effective the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no costs will be imposed in connection with this reinstatement proceeding.	05/10/2022
#2020AP298-CR	<u>State v. Joseph G. Green:</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS LIMITED IN PART AND AFFIRMED IN PART. ROGGENSACK, J. , delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ZIEGLER, C.J. , REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY , and HAGEDORN, JJ. , joined, and in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY and KAROFISKY, JJ. , joined with respect to Part II.D., and in which DALLET, J. , joined with respect to Part II.D. and ¶¶3 and 53. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J. , filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part, in which DALLET and KAROFISKY, JJ. , joined.	05/13/2022

#2020AP704

Daniel Doubek v. Joshua Kaul:
**THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER OF THE
CIRCUIT COURT IS REVERSED AND
THE CAUSE REMANDED.**
HAGEDORN, J., delivered the majority
opinion for a unanimous Court. KAROFSKY,
J., filed a concurring opinion.

05/20/2022

#2019AP221-CR

State v. Nhia Lee:
PER CURIAM.
**THE REVIEW OF THE DECISION OF
THE COURT OF APPEALS IS
DISMISSED AS IMPROVIDENTLY
GRANTED.**
REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J., filed a
concurring opinion in which ZIEGLER, C.J.
and HAGEDORN, J., joined. DALLET, J.,
filed a dissenting opinion, in which ANN
WALSH BRADLEY, J., joined.

05/24/2022

#2021AP1106-D

**Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Melinda R.
Alfredson:**
PER CURIAM.
IT IS ORDERED that the license of Melinda
R. Alfredson is suspended for a period of one
year, effective the date of this order. **IT IS
FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of
the date of this order, Melinda R. Alfredson
shall pay \$250 in restitution to L.P. **IT IS
FURTHER ORDERED** that the restitution
specified above is to be completed prior to
paying costs to the Office of Lawyer Regulation.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 60
days of the date of this order, Melinda R.
Alfredson shall pay to the Office of Lawyer
Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which
are \$2,552.11 as of March 14, 2022. **IT IS
FURTHER ORDERED** that Melinda R.
Alfredson 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).

05/25/2022

#2019AP1046-CR

State v. Theophilous Ruffin:
THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED.

05/26/2022

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous Court.

#2022AP673-D

Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Laura R. Schwefel:
PER CURIAM.

05/26/2022

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for consensual license revocation is granted. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the license of Laura R. Schwefel to practice law in Wisconsin is revoked, effective July 7, 2022. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 60 days of the date of this order, Laura R. Schwefel shall pay restitution in the amount of \$75,298.13 to H.K. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Laura R. Schwefel 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.

ZIEGLER, C. J. filed a concurring opinion, in which **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY** and **HAGEDORN, JJ.**, joined.