

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 5-0, 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
19 (41%)	9 (20%)	9 (20%)	9 (20%)²
<i>State v. Sahs</i>	<i>State v. Neumann</i>	<i>State v. Steffes</i>	<i>Rock-Koshkonong Lake District v. State Dep't of Natural Res.</i>
<i>Park Bank v. Westburg</i>	<i>Johnson v. Masters</i>	<i>McLeod v. Mudlaff (In re the estate of Nancy Ellen Laubenheimer)</i>	<i>State v. Starks</i>
<i>Xcel Energy Servs. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm'n</i>	<i>Tufail v. Midwest Hospitality, LLC</i>	<i>State v. Avery</i>	<i>Outagamie County v. Melanie L. (In re Melanie L.)</i>
<i>State v. Alexander</i>	<i>State v. Brereton</i>	<i>State v. Taylor</i>	<i>Juneau County Star-Times v. Juneau County</i>
<i>State v. Burton</i>	<i>State v. Lemoine</i>	<i>Schinner v. Gundrum</i>	<i>Bethke v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Brown v. Acuity</i>	<i>Marlowe v. IDS Prop. Cas. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Bostco LLC v. Milwaukee Metro. Sewerage Dist. (4-2)</i>	<i>State v. Gracia</i>
<i>Paul Davis Restoration of S.E. Wis., Inc. v. Paul Davis Restoration of Northeast Wis.</i>	<i>State v. Travis (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Beamon (4-2)</i>	<i>Dane County DHS v. Mable K., Lee H.</i>
<i>Showers Appraisals, LLC v. Musson Bros.</i>	<i>Beidel v. Sideline Software, Inc. (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Sobczak (4-2)</i>	<i>In re State v. Buchanan</i>
<i>United Concrete & Constr., Inc. v. Red-D-Mix Concrete, Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Edler (5-1)</i>	<i>Waller v. Am. Transmission Co., LLC (4-2)</i>	<i>Dane County v. Sheila W. (In re Interest of Sheila W.) (per curiam)</i>
<i>State v. Melton</i>			
<i>Rosecky v. Schissel</i>			
<i>Vill. of Elm Grove v. Brefka</i>			
<i>Manitowoc County v. Samuel J.H. (In re Mental Commitment of Samuel J.H.)</i>			
<i>State v. Lonkoski</i>			
<i>Jamerson v. Dep't of Children & Families</i>			
<i>Estate of Hopgood v. Boyd</i>			
<i>State v. Deadwiller (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Novy (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Johnson (5-0 per curiam)</i>			

¹ In two cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*State v. Edler* [Ziegler] and *Marlowe v. IDS Prop. Cas. Ins. Co.* [Prosser]). 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 (as both of these opinions did), it was classified as a dissent. Had either opinion concurred with the result on all issues but disputed the majority's reasoning on one or more issues, it would have been classified as a concurrence. Occasionally 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.