

TABLE 2

All 42 Cases in Which the SPD Gave Oral Argument¹

Justice	Votes Favoring SPD	Total Votes Cast	Percent Favoring SPD
Abrahamson	30	42	71%
Bradley	27	42	64%
Crooks	9	42	21%
Prosser	6	37	16%
Roggensack	7	42	17%
Ziegler	7	42	17%
Gableman	8	42	19%

In 35 of the 42 cases, the defendant had been charged with a crime. These 35 cases are the subject of Table 3.

TABLE 3

	Votes Favoring SPD	Total Votes Cast	Percent Favoring SPD
Abrahamson	26	35	74%
Bradley	23	35	66%
Crooks	5	35	14%
Prosser	4	31	13%
Roggensack	3	35	9%
Ziegler	3	35	9%
Gableman	4	35	11%

In 7 of the 42 cases, isolated in Table 4, the principal figure was not accused of a crime.² These cases hinged on such issues as parental rights, an attorney’s compliance with rules for filing a brief, mandatory medical treatment, involuntary commitment of a person suffering from

¹ As explained above, in *State v. Carter* Justice Roggensack concurred in part and dissented in part in a manner that merits classifying her opinion as favoring the SPD.

² The seven cases are: *Manitowoc County v. Samuel J.H. (In re Mental Commitment of Samuel J.H.)*; *Outagamie County v. Melanie L. (In re Mental Commitment of Melanie L.)*; *Dane County v. Sheila W. (In re Interest of Sheila W.)*; *State v. Court of Appeals (In re State v. Buchanan)*; *Fond du Lac County v. Helen E.F. (In re Mental Commitment of Helen E.F.)*; *State v. Nielsen (In re Sanctions Imposed in State v. Nielsen)*; and *Tammy W-G. v. Jacob T. (In re Termination of Parental Rights to Gwenevere T.)*.

In *Dane County v. Sheila W. (In re Interest of Sheila W.)*, the majority ruled that the questions presented were moot and thus declined to decide the dispute’s central issues. While acknowledging that the issues in her case had become moot, Sheila W. (represented by the SPD) argued that they remained of significance and thus should be addressed by the Court. The three dissenting justices (Roggensack, Ziegler, and Gableman) agreed that the issues were “of great public importance that are likely to recur” and complained that the majority “washes its hands of the matter and declares the case moot.” Thus their three votes are categorized as favorable to the SPD—though it remains unknown whether their answers to the moot questions would have won the approval of Sheila W.

Alzheimer’s Disease, and the lack of need for permission from a court for parties to use presentence-investigation-report information in appeals.

TABLE 4

	Votes Favoring SPD	Total Votes Cast	Percent Favoring SPD
Abrahamson	4	7	57%
Bradley	4	7	57%
Crooks	4	7	57%
Prosser	2	6	33%
Roggensack	4	7	57%
Ziegler	4	7	57%
Gableman	4	7	57%