



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

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### NOVEMBER 2019

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of November 2019 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2019.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

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

	<u>November 2019</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	1	7
Judicial disciplinary cases.....	0	0
Bar Admissions .....	0	0
Civil cases .....	0	0
Criminal cases .....	4	4

#### Petitions for Review

A total of 34 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 November, the Supreme Court disposed of 33 petitions for review, of which 2 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 176 petitions for review pending.

	<u>November 2019</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	36	146
Civil cases .....	10	45
Criminal cases.....	26	101

Petition for Review dispositions .....	33	121
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	11 (1)	44 (7)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	22 (1)	77 (5)

### Petitions for Bypass

In November, the Supreme Court received one petition 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 may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has 5 petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>November 2019</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	1	4
Civil cases .....	0	3
Criminal cases .....	1	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	1	2
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	1 (0)	2 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	0 (0)

### Requests for Certification

During November, 2019, 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>November 2019</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 (0)

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 one such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 6 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 action was 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 12 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

November 2019 Term to Date

Filings

Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	2	11
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	3	14
Other (including Original Actions).....	3	4

Dispositions by Order

Attorney discipline.....	1	1
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	3	13
Other (including Original Actions).....	2	5

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT  
OPINIONS ISSUED DURING NOVEMBER 2019**

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
#2017AP1416-CR	State of Wisconsin v. Matthew C. Hinkle – <b>THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.</b> <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Bradley, R.G., J <u>Dissent:</u> Dallet, J. and Bradley, A.W., J – opin. filed. Hagedorn, J. not participating	11/12/2019
#2017AP1104-CR	State of Wisconsin v. Roy S. Anderson <b>THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.</b> <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Bradley, A. W., J. <u>Concur:</u> Hagedorn, J. and Ziegler, J. – opin. filed.	11/15/2019
#2019AP577-D	In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings Against Ricardo Perez, Attorney at Law: Office of Lawyer Regulation v. Ricardo Perez – <b>IT IS ORDERED</b> that the license of Ricardo Perez to practice law in Wisconsin is suspended for nine months, effective the date of this order. <b>IT IS FURTHER ORDERED</b> that, that within 60 days of the date of this order, Ricardo Perez shall pay to the Office of Lawyer Regulation the costs of this proceeding, which are \$1,957.12 as of August 21, 2019. <b>IT IS FURTHER ORDERED</b> that to the extent he has not already done so, Ricardo Perez 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. <b>IT IS FURTHER ORDERED</b> that compliance	11/19/2019

with all conditions of this order is required for reinstatement. See SCR 22.29(4). **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the temporary suspension of Ricardo Perez's Wisconsin law license imposed on February 14, 2018 is hereby lifted.

Published Per Curiam

#2019AP912-CR

#2019AP914-CR

State of Wisconsin v. Autumn Marie Love Lopez / State of Wisconsin v. Amy J. Rodriquez – **THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AFFIRMED.**

Majority Opinion: Ziegler, J.

Concur: Bradley R.G., J. (Only in mandate of lead opinion) and Kelly, J. (except footnote 2 and statement in ¶34 that Justice R.G. Bradley does not join the lead opinion) – opin. filed.

Kelly, J. concurs (except ¶¶25-31) – opin. filed.

Dissent: Bradley, A.W., J. and Dallet, J. – opin. filed.

11/27/2019