



# 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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

Hon. Randy R. Koschnick  
Director of State Courts

Sheila T. Reiff  
Clerk of Supreme Court

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### February 2018

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of February 2018 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2017.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions involving 6 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 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>6</u>	<u>33</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	1	14
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar admission cases.....	0	0
Civil cases .....	3	11
Criminal cases .....	2	8

#### 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 February, the Supreme Court disposed of 56 petitions for review, of which 4 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 179 petitions for review pending.

	<u>February 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	<u>54</u>	<u>342</u>
Civil cases .....	16	154
Criminal cases .....	38	188

Petition for Review dispositions .....	<u>56</u>	<u>426</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	33 (4)	206 (19)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	23 (0)	220 (8)

Petitions for Bypass

In February 2018, 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 2 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>February 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>
Civil cases .....	0	4
Criminal cases .....	0	4
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	4 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	6 (2)

Requests for Certification

During February 2018, the Supreme Court received 1 request 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 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Civil cases .....	0	0
Criminal cases .....	1	2
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	1 (1)
Criminal cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	3 (3)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, there were 3 matters filed within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) and 0 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 5 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. 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 29 regulatory matters and 14 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>February 2018</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	3	28
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	5	26
Other (including Original Actions and Certified Questions).	0	2
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	2	3
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	2	24
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	5

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT  
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING FEBRUARY 2018**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2016AP2214	Madison Teachers, Inc. v. James R. Scott Order of the circuit court is reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C. J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J., joined by Bradley, A.W., J.	02/06/2018
2015AP1039	John Y. Westmas v. Selective Insurance Company of South Carolina Decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C. J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, R. G., J. joined by Kelly, J. Abrahamson, J. did not participate.	02/07/2018
2015AP1567-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation v. George W. Curtis, Jr. License suspended. <u>Per Curiam</u> <sup>1</sup>	02/15/2018
2015AP2506-CR	State v. Daniel J. H. Bartelt Decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, C. J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, A. W., J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	02/20/2018
2015AP2429-CR	State v. Shannon Olance Hendricks Decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Bradley, R. G., J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, J. joined by Bradley, A. W., J.	02/20/2018
2015AP2224	Wisconsin Association of State Prosecutors v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission Decision of the Court of Appeals is reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, A. W., J. joined by Abrahamson, J.	02/28/2018

---

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