

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 5-0, 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2, 3-1)	4-3 (or 3-2)
43 (63%)	4 (6%)	6 (9%)	15 (22%)
<i>Sanders v. Sanders</i> (5-0)	<i>Sands v. Whitnall Sch. Dist.</i>	<i>Rao v. WMA Sec., Inc.</i>	<i>Wis. Dep't of Revenue v. Menasha Corp.</i>
<i>WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex</i> (6-0)	<i>Larry v. Harris</i>	<i>State v. Popenhagen</i>	<i>Stuart v. Weisflog's Showroom Gallery, Inc.</i>
<i>Steinmann v. Steinmann</i> (6-0)	<i>Hefty v. Strickhouser</i>	<i>State v. Davis</i>	<i>Gumz v. N. States Power Co.</i>
<i>State v. Hambly</i> (6-0)	<i>Stone v. Acuity</i> (5-1)	<i>State v. Grunke</i>	<i>State v. Harenda Enters.</i>
<i>AccuWeb, Inc. v. Foley & Lardner</i> (6-0)		<i>State v. Beaver Dam Area Dev. Corp.</i> (4-2)	<i>Helgeland v. Wis. Municipalities</i>
<i>Hornback v. Archdiocese of Milwaukee</i> (6-0)		<i>Eichenseer v. Madison-Dane County Tavern League, Inc.</i> (3-1)	<i>Richards v. Badger Mut. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Liebovich v. Minn. Ins. Co.</i> (6-0)			<i>Below v. Norton</i>
<i>State v. MacArthur</i> (6-0)			<i>Storms v. Action Wis. Inc.</i>
<i>Rechsteiner v. Hazelden</i> (6-0)			<i>J.G. v. Wangard</i>
<i>Adrian T. Hipp v. Circuit Court for Milwaukee County</i> (6-0)			<i>Racine County v. Int'l Ass'n of Machinists & Aero. Workers, Dist. 10, AFL-CIO</i>
<i>State v. Keyes</i>			<i>State v. Arias</i>
<i>Stuart v. Weisflog's Showroom Gallery, Inc.</i>			<i>Muller v. Soc'y Ins.</i>
<i>Berner Cheese Corp. v. Krug, No.</i>			<i>Estate of Otto v. Physicians Ins. Co. of Wis., Inc.</i>
<i>Schmidt v. N. States Power Co.</i>			<i>Town of Madison v. County of Dane</i>
<i>State v. Duchow</i>			<i>Summers v. Touchpoint Health Plan, Inc.</i> (3-2)
<i>Olson v. Town of Cottage Grove</i>			
<i>State v. Plude</i>			
<i>Estate of Matteson v. Matteson</i>			
<i>Novell v. Migliaccio</i>			
<i>State v. Straszkowski</i>			
<i>State v. Summer</i>			
<i>Nichols v. Progressive N. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Town of Rhine v. Bizzell</i>			
<i>State v. Quintana</i>			
<i>State v. Walker</i>			
<i>State v. LaCount</i>			
<i>State v. Ford</i>			
<i>State v. Harris</i>			
<i>Estate of Sustache v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>			

(continued on following page)

¹ In four cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*Stuart* [Roggensack, Prosser, Ziegler]; *Stone* [Butler, Roggensack]; *Larry* [Butler]; *Popenhagen* [Ziegler]). 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.

<i>Acuity v. Bagadia</i>
<i>State v. Schaefer</i>
<i>State v. Jorgensen</i>
<i>Walgreen Co. v. City of Madison</i>
<i>State v. Sanders</i>
<i>State v. Doss</i>
<i>C. Coakley Relocation Sys. v. City of Milwaukee</i>
<i>State v. Hubbard</i>
<i>Watton v. Hegerty</i>
<i>Washburn County v. Smith</i>
<i>Walworth County DH&HS v. Andrea L. O.</i>
<i>Gresens v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>State v. Her (7-0 per curiam)</i>
<i>City of Sheboygan v. Nytsch (6-0 per curiam)</i>