

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
29/53 (55%)	6/53 (11%)	17/53 (32%)	1/53 (2%)
<i>State v. Gonzalez</i>	<i>Augsburger v. Homestead Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Stoker v. Milwaukee County</i>	<i>State v. Dillard</i>
<i>118th St. Kenosha, LLC v. Wis. DOT</i>	<i>Preisler v. General Cas. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Foster</i>	
<i>State v. Hemp</i>	<i>State v. Anthony</i>	<i>State v. Alger (In re Alger)</i>	
<i>Outagamie County v. Michael H. (In re Michael H.)</i>	<i>Milwaukee City Hous. Auth. v. Cobb</i>	<i>Schwegel v. Milwaukee County</i>	
<i>State v. Kennedy</i>	<i>Oneida Seven Generations Corp. v. City of Green Bay</i>	<i>State v. Hurley</i>	
<i>State v. Tullberg</i>	<i>Wilson Mut. Ins. Co. v. Falk (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Wilson</i>	
<i>State v. Harrison</i>		<i>State v. Moore</i>	
<i>State v. Alexander</i>		<i>State v. Delebreau</i>	
<i>Bank of N.Y. Mellon v. Carson</i>		<i>Christ v. Exxon Mobil Corp.</i>	
<i>Anderson v. Aul</i>		<i>Wis. Realtors Ass'n v. PSC of Wis.</i>	
<i>State v. Scull</i>		<i>State v. Kucharski</i>	
<i>Acuity, A Mut. Ins. Co. v. Chartis Specialty Ins. Co.</i>		<i>State v. Shata</i>	
<i>State v. Kempainen</i>		<i>State v. Guarnero</i>	
<i>First Weber Grp., Inc. v. Synergy Real Estate Grp., LLC</i>		<i>State v. Ortiz-Mondragon</i>	
<i>Aguilar v. Husco Int'l, Inc.</i>		<i>State v. Hogan</i>	
<i>State v. Luedtke</i>		<i>State v. Houghton</i>	
<i>Runzheimer Int'l, Ltd. v. Friedlen</i>		<i>State ex rel. Two Unnamed Petitioners v. Peterson (4-2)</i>	
<i>State v. Blatterman</i>			
<i>MS Real Estate Holdings, LLC v. Donald P. Fox Family Trust</i>			
<i>State v. Chamblis</i>			
<i>State v. Obriecht</i>			
<i>Dakter v. Cavallino</i>			
<i>Mayhugh v. State</i>			
<i>State v. Williams</i>			
<i>State v. Herrmann</i>			
<i>State v. Griep (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Daniel (6-0)</i>			
<i>Journal Times v. City of Racine Bd. of Police & Fire Comm'rs (6-0)</i>			
<i>Ash Park, LLC v. Alexander & Bishop, Ltd. (6-0)</i>			

¹ In *State ex rel. Two Unnamed Petitioners v. Peterson*, Justices Abrahamson and Crooks concurred in part and dissented in part. For this table, and those prepared for other years, each such vote has been 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 of Justices Abrahamson and Crooks in *Peterson* have been classified as dissents.