

Decisions by Vote Split<sup>1</sup>

<b>7-0 (or 6-0)</b>	<b>6-1 (or 5-1, 4-1)</b>	<b>5-2 (or 4-2)</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>26 (39%)</b>	<b>10 (15%)</b>	<b>14 (21%)</b>	<b>17 (25%)</b>
<i>Wickenhauser v. Lehtinen</i>	<i>State v. Mayo</i>	<i>City of Janesville v. CC Midwest, Inc.</i>	<i>Indus. Roofing Servs. v. Marquardt</i>
<i>State v. Muckerheide</i>	<i>State v. Jensen</i>	<i>State ex rel. Pharm v. Bartow</i>	<i>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Bailey</i>
<i>State v. Jenkins</i>	<i>Aslakson v. Gallagher Bassett Servs.</i>	<i>Wis. Dep't of Revenue v. River City Refuse Removal, Inc.</i>	<i>Meyers v. Bayer AG</i>
<i>McNeil v. Hansen</i>	<i>Shannon E. T. v. Alicia M. V.M.</i>	<i>State v. Gary Johnson</i>	<i>Tietsworth v. Harley-Davidson, Inc.</i>
<i>State v. Brown</i>	<i>Frisch v. Henrichs</i>	<i>State v. Bannister</i>	<i>Estate of Szleszinski v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>State v. Parent</i>	<i>State v. House</i>	<i>Kolupar v. Wilde Pontiac Cadillac, Inc.</i>	<i>DaimlerChrysler v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>Kristi L.M. v. Dennis E.M.</i>	<i>State v. Post</i>	<i>Milwaukee Reg'l Med. Ctr., Inc. v. City of Wauwatosa</i>	<i>Acuity Mut. Ins. Co. v. Olivas</i>
<i>HSBC Realty Credit Corp. v. City of Glendale</i>	<i>State ex rel. Buswell v. Tomah Area Sch. Dist.</i>	<i>State ex rel. Thomas v. Schwarz</i>	<i>State v. Howell</i>
<i>State v. Marcus Johnson</i>	<i>Estate of Rille v. Physicians Ins. Co. (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Bruski</i>	<i>State v. Lackershire</i>
<i>Avery v. Diedrich</i>	<i>Rouse v. Theda Clark Med. Ctr. (4-1)</i>	<i>FAS, LLC v. Town of Bass Lake</i>	<i>State v. Schweda</i>
<i>Wambolt v. West Bend Mut. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>John Doe 1 v. Archdiocese of Milwaukee</i>	<i>Marotz v. Hallman</i>
<i>State v. Nelis</i>		<i>Leitinger v. DBart, Inc.</i>	<i>Lornson v. Siddiqui</i>
<i>Pool v. City of Sheboygan</i>		<i>County of Milwaukee v. Williams</i>	<i>Oneida County Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Nicole W.</i>
<i>K&amp;S Tool &amp; Die Corp. v. Perfection Mach. Sales, Inc.</i>		<i>Stoughton Trailers, Inc. v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n (4-2)</i>	<i>Kocken v. Wis. Council 40</i>
<i>Tyler v. RiverBank</i>			<i>Trinity Petroleum, Inc. v. Scott Oil Co.</i>
<i>State v. Grady</i>			<i>DeHart v. Wis. Mut. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Russ v. Russ</i>			<i>State v. Bobby G.</i>
<i>State v. Shirley E.</i>			
<i>City of Milwaukee v. Washington</i>			
<i>Zellner v. Cedarburg Sch. Dist.</i>			

(continued on following page)

<sup>1</sup> In eight cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*Jensen* [Butler]; *Milwaukee Reg'l Med. Ctr.* [Butler, Abrahamson]; *Schweda* [Prosser, Wilcox, Roggensack]; *John Doe* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Lornson* [Crooks, Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Post* [Abrahamson]; *Trinity Petroleum* [Roggensack, Wilcox, Prosser]; *Buswell* [Butler]). 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. Accordingly, the votes in the eight cases listed above have been classified as dissents. In one or two instances the dividing line between a dissent and a concurrence was rather thin, and views might reasonably differ as to the opinion's proper classification. However, such ambiguous opinions amount to a minuscule fraction of the hundreds of votes cast, and thus they have a negligible effect on the tables presented here.

<i>State v. Townsend</i> (7-0 per curiam)
<i>State v. Kasmarek</i> (7-0 per curiam)
<i>State v. Lord</i> (7-0 per curiam)
<i>Brew City Redevelopment Group, LLC v. Ferchill Group</i> (6-0)
<i>State ex rel. Castaneda v. Welch</i> (6-0)
<i>Kasten v. Doral Dental USA, LLC</i> (6-0)