



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

DECEMBER 2022

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

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 3 cases in December. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>December 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	1	4
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions	0	0
Civil cases	1	3
Criminal cases	1	3

Petitions for Review

A total of 57 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 December, the Supreme Court disposed of 38 petitions for review, of which 3 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 157 petitions for review pending.

	<u>December 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	57	172
Civil cases	33	83
Criminal cases	24	89

Petition for Review dispositions	38	182
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	16 (1)	76 (8)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	22 (2)	106 (5)

Petitions for Bypass

In December, the Supreme Court received 2 petition for bypass and disposed of 4 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 December also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has 2 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>December 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	2	7
Civil cases	1	6
Criminal cases	1	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	4	7
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	4 (1)	7 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Requests for Certification

During December 2022, 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>December 2022</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	0	<u>0</u>
Civil cases	0	0
Criminal cases	0	0
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	1 (1)

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) was 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 92 regulatory matters and 12 petitions for supervisory writs pending.

	<u>December 2022</u> <u>Term to Date</u>	
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	1	5
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	7	25
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	1
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	0	0
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	11	29
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	1

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

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2021AP142-CR	<p><u>State v. Charles W. Richey</u> THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REVERSED, AND THE CAUSE IS REMANDED TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS CONSISTENT WITH THIS OPINION. DALLET, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, and KAROFSKY, JJ., joined. ROGGENSACK, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which ZIEGLER, C.J., and HAGEDORN, J., joined.</p>	12/09/2022
#2022AP830-D	<p><u>Office of Lawyer Regulation v. John J. Pangallo</u> PER CURIAM. IT IS ORDERED that the license of John J. Pangallo to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for a period of three years, effective the date of this order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative suspension of John J. Pangallo's license to practice law in Wisconsin, due to his failure to pay mandatory bar dues and failure to comply with continuing legal education requirements, will remain in effect until each reason for the administrative suspension has been rectified, pursuant to SCR 22.28(1). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, to the extent he has not already done so, John J. Pangallo 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.</p>	12/22/2022

**Matthew W. Murphy v. Columbus
McKinnon Corporation**

**THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF
APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.**

ROGGENSACK, J., delivered the majority opinion of the Court, in which **ANN WALSH BRADLEY, DALLET,** and **KAROFSKY, JJ.**, joined except for ¶¶38 and 41. **KAROFSKY, J.**, filed a concurring opinion, in which **ANN WALSH BRADLEY** and **DALLET, JJ.**, joined. **HAGEDORN, J.**, filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part, in which **ZIEGLER, C.J.**, and **REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, J.**, joined.