

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3 (or 3-2)
25/58 (43%)	6/58 (10%)	17/58 (29%)	10/58 (17%)
<i>Estate of Sheppard v. Schleis</i>	<i>State v. Conger</i>	<i>State v. Littlejohn</i>	<i>State v. Pinkard</i>
<i>State v. Cross</i>	<i>Groshek v. Trewin</i>	<i>State v. Carroll</i>	<i>Soc’y Ins. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm’n</i>
<i>In re Elijah W.L.</i>	<i>E-L Enters. v. Milwaukee Metro. Sewerage Dist.</i>	<i>State v. Dearborn</i>	<i>State v. Carter</i>
<i>MercyCare Ins. Co. v. Wis. Comm’r of Ins</i>	<i>Grygiel v. Monches Fish & Game Club, Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Wood</i>	<i>Sands v. Menard</i>
<i>Hocking v. City of Dodgeville</i>	<i>Brunton v. Nuvel Credit Corp.</i>	<i>State v. Kleser</i>	<i>State v. Henley</i>
<i>Leavitt v. Beverly Enters.</i>	<i>State v. Arends (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Robinson</i>	<i>Tatera v. FMC Corp.</i>
<i>State v. Jones</i>		<i>State v. Sveum</i>	<i>Pries v. McMillon</i>
<i>McConkey v. Van Hollen</i>		<i>State v. Artic</i>	<i>State v. Imani</i>
<i>Ash Park, LLC v. Alexander & Bishop, Ltd.</i>		<i>Schill v. Wis. Rapids Sch. Dist.</i>	<i>Johnson Controls, Inc. v. London Mkt.</i>
<i>Konneker v. Romano</i>		<i>Borek Cranberry Marsh, Inc. v. Jackson County</i>	<i>Admanco, Inc. v. 700 Stanton Drive, LLC (3-2)</i>
<i>Miller v. Hanover Ins. Co.</i>		<i>State v. Smith</i>	
<i>Volvo Trucks N. Am. v. State DOT</i>		<i>Blum v. 1st Auto & Cas. Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>Roehl Transp., Inc. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra, Inc. v. Wis. Dep’t of Revenue</i>	
<i>State v. Carter</i>		<i>Md. Arms Ltd. P’ship v. Connell</i>	
<i>Zarder v. Humana Ins. Co.</i>		<i>Wis. Med. Soc’y, Inc. v. Morgan</i>	
<i>State v. Harris</i>		<i>Bank Mut. v. S.J. Boyer Constr., Inc. (4-2)</i>	
<i>State v. Ringer</i>		<i>State v. Hess (4-2)</i>	
<i>Solowicz v. Forward Geneva Nat’l, LLC</i>			
<i>Saddle Ridge Corp. v. Bd. of Review</i>			
<i>Racine County v. Oracular Milwaukee, Inc.</i>			

(continued on the following page)

¹ The percentages are rounded. In nine cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*State v. Carter* [Roggensack]; *Ehlinger v. Hauser* [Prosser, Ziegler, Gableman]; *Brunton v. Nuvel Credit Corp* [Gableman]; *State v. Kleser* [Bradley, Abrahamson]; *Groshek v. Trewin* [Abrahamson]; *Blum v. 1st Auto & Cas. Ins. Co.* [Bradley, Abrahamson, Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman]; *State v. Imani* [Crooks, Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra, Inc. v. Wis. Dep’t of Revenue* [Roggensack, Gableman]; *Grygiel v. Monches Fish & Game Club, Inc.* [Abrahamson]). These “split votes” were categorized as either a dissent or a concurrence according to the following guidelines. If a justice’s opinion dissented from the result on one or more issues, it was classified as a dissent. If the opinion concurred with the result on all issues, but disputed the majority’s reasoning on one or more issues, it was classified as a concurrence. In a few instances the dividing line between a dissent and a concurrence is exceedingly thin, and views might reasonably differ as to the opinion’s proper classification. However, such ambiguous opinions amount to only a handful of the hundreds of votes cast, and thus they have a negligible effect on the tables presented here. As noted above, the table does not include *Ehlinger v. Hauser*.

State v. McGuire

*Pawlowski v. Am. Family Mut.
Ins. Co.*

State v. Fischer

State v. Allen

State v. Jensen (6-0)