

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 5-0, 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
35 (57%)	7 (11%)	12 (20%)	7 (11%) ²
<i>Behrendt v. Gulf Underwriters Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Apple Valley Gardens Ass'n v. MacHutta</i>	<i>Farmers Auto. Ins. Ass'n v. Union Pac. Ry.</i>	<i>Christensen v. Sullivan</i>
<i>State v. Grady</i>	<i>Baldwin-Woodville Area Sch. Dist. v. W. Cent. Educ. Ass'n - Baldwin Woodville Unit</i>	<i>Harvot v. Solo Cup Co.</i>	<i>City of Milwaukee Post No. 2874 VFW v. Redevelopment Auth.</i>
<i>PRN Assocs. LLC v. State Dep't of Admin.</i>	<i>Luckett v. Bodner</i>	<i>Heritage Farms, Inc. v. Markel Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Coulee Catholic Sch. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>State v. Johnson</i>	<i>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel v. Wis. Dep't of Admin.</i>	<i>Krier v. Vilione</i>	<i>Estate of Genrich v. OHIC Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Osborn v. Dennison</i>	<i>Plastics Eng'g Co. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Lisowski v. Hastings Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Ho-Chunk Nation v. Dep't of Revenue</i>
<i>State v. Ferguson</i>	<i>Zellner v. Herrick</i>	<i>Phelps v. Physicians Ins. Co. of Wis., Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Ward</i>
<i>State v. Lange</i>	<i>State v. McClaren (5-1)</i>	<i>Star Direct Inc. v. Dal Pra</i>	<i>Umansky v. ABC Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Tammi v. Porsche Cars N. Am., Inc.</i>		<i>State v. Fernandez</i>	
<i>Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co. v. Golke</i>		<i>State v. Payano</i>	
<i>Blunt v. Medtronic, Inc.</i>		<i>Horst v. Deere & Co. (4-2)</i>	
<i>County of Dane v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm'n</i>		<i>Notz v. Everett Smith Group, Ltd. (4-2)</i>	
<i>D.L. Anderson's Lakeside Leisure Co. v. Anderson</i>		<i>Tensfeldt v. Haberman (4-2)</i>	
<i>De La Trinidad v. Capitol Indem. Corp.</i>			
<i>Froedtert Mem'l Lutheran Hosp., Inc. v. Nat'l States Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Kenosha Prof'l Firefighters, Local 414 v. City of Kenosha</i>			
<i>Loth v. City of Milwaukee</i>			
<i>Noffke v. Bakke</i>			
<i>State v. Denk</i>			
<i>State v. Hoppe</i>			
<i>State v. Kramer</i>			
<i>State v. Long</i>			
<i>State v. Ndina</i>			
<i>State v. Popke</i>			
<i>State v. Romero</i>			
<i>State v. Warbelton</i>			

(continued on following page)

¹ In five cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*Notz* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Tensfeldt* [Roggensack, Ziegler]; *Estate of Genrich* [Abrahamson, Bradley, Crooks]; *Star Direct* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Plastics* [Gableman]). For this table, and those that follow, each of these votes was 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.

² The percentages do not add up to 100 because of rounding.

<i>State v. Gajewski (per curiam)</i>
<i>State v. Welda (per curiam)</i>
<i>Bubb v. Brusky (6-0)</i>
<i>Godoy v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (6-0)</i>
<i>Hocking v. City of Dodgeville (6-0)</i>
<i>State ex rel. Robins v. Madden (In re Doe) (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Baron (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Tody (6-0)</i>
<i>Nedvidek v. Kuipers (6-0 per curiam)</i>
<i>Hipp v. Murray (In re Doe) (5-0 per curiam)</i>