

STATISTICS ON WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 2015-2016

Four-to-Three Decisions

4-3 (or 3-2) Alignments

Justices	Total	Case Names
Prosser, Roggensack, Gableman (3-2)	1	<i>Wisconsin Pharmacal v. Nebraska Cultures</i>
Abrahamson, A.W. Bradley, Prosser (3-2)	1	<i>Burgraff v. Menard</i>
Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman (3-2)	1	<i>State DOJ v. State Dept. of Workforce Dev.</i>
Abrahamson, A.W. Bradley, Prosser, R.G. Bradley	1	<i>Moustakis v. State</i>
Abrahamson, A.W. Bradley, Prosser, Gableman	1	<i>Coyne v. Walker</i>
Abrahamson, A.W. Bradley, Ziegler, Gableman	1	<i>Roberts v. T.H.E. Insurance</i>
Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman, R.G. Bradley	1	<i>State v. Matalonis</i>

4-3 Membership in the Majority

Justice	Votes
Abrahamson	4
A.W. Bradley	4
Prosser	4
Roggensack	3
Ziegler	3
Gableman	5
R.G. Bradley	2

4-3 Majority Opinions Authored

Justice	Opinions
Abrahamson	1
A.W. Bradley	2
Prosser	0
Roggensack	1
Ziegler	2
Gableman	1
R.G. Bradley	0
Total	7

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3 (or 3-2)
7/40 (18%)	2/40 (5%)	24/40 (60%)	7/40 (18%)
<i>State v. Eric L. Loomis</i>	<i>Fontana Builders, Inc. v. Assurance Company of America</i>	<i>Aman Singh v. Paul Kemper²</i>	<i>State v. Matalonis</i>
<i>David M. Marks v. Houston Casualty Company</i>	<i>Hoffer Properties v. State of Wisconsin, Department of Transportation (5-1)</i>	<i>City of Eau Claire v. Melissa M. Booth</i>	<i>Patti J. Roberts v. T.H.E. Insurance Company</i>
<i>State v. Richard J. Sulla</i>		<i>State v. Timothy L. Finley, Jr.</i>	<i>Albert D. Moustakis v. State of Wisconsin Department of Justice</i>
<i>State v. Patrick K. Tourville</i>		<i>Sonja Blake v. Debra Jossart</i>	<i>Peggy Z. Coyne v. Scott Walker</i>
<i>State v. Leopoldo R. Salas Gayton (6-0)</i>		<i>Dennis D. Dufour v. Progressive Classic Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State DOJ v. State Dept. of Workforce Dev. (3-2)</i>
<i>S. A. M. v. Nancy M. Meister (6-0)</i>		<i>State v. Mastella L. Jackson</i>	<i>Wisconsin Pharmacal Company, LLC v. Nebraska Cultures of California, Inc. (3-2)</i>
<i>State v. Iverson (6-0)</i>		<i>Water Well Solutions Service Group Inc. v. Consolidated Insurance Company</i>	<i>Kenneth C. Burgraff, Sr. v. Menard, Inc. (3-2)</i>
		<i>Prince Corporation v. James N. Vandenberg</i>	
		<i>John Doe 56 v. Mayo Clinic Health System - Eau Claire Clinic, Inc.</i>	
		<i>Milwaukee Police Association v. City of Milwaukee</i>	
		<i>State v. Luis C. Salinas</i>	
		<i>Cheryl M. Sorenson v. Richard A. Batchelder</i>	
		<i>St. Croix County Department of Health and Human Services v. Michael D</i>	
		<i>Walworth State Bank v. Abbey Springs Condominium Association, Inc.</i>	
		<i>State v. Lagrone</i>	
		<i>State v. Andy J. Parisi</i>	
		<i>Lands' End, Inc. v. City of Dodgeville (4-2)</i>	
		<i>State v. Rory A. McKellips (4-2)</i>	
		<i>State v. Stephen LeMere (4-2)</i>	

(continued on following page)

¹ Due to rounding, the percentages do not add up to 100. Occasionally a decision finds a justice concurring in part and dissenting 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.

² *Singh v. Kemper* was a fractured decision, and views may differ regarding the appropriate column in which to place it.

	<i>State v. Jimmie Lee Smith</i> (4-2)
	<i>United Food & Commercial Workers Union v. Hormel Foods Corporation</i> (4-2)
	<i>State v. Valadez</i> (4-2)
	<i>State v. Brett W. Dumstrey</i> (4-2)
	<i>Winnebago County v. Christopher S.</i> (4-2)

Frequency in the Majority

These charts display how frequently each justice voted in the majority in decisions filed during the 2015-16 term. The first chart includes all cases in which a justice voted (out of the total of 40 cases, specified above), while the second chart includes only cases decided by split votes.

All Cases

Justice	Majority Votes Cast	Total Votes Cast	Percent in Majority
Abrahamson	18	40	45%
A.W. Bradley	18	40	45%
Prosser	33	38	87%
Roggensack	32	39	82%
Ziegler	34	39	87%
Gableman	37	39	95%
R.G. Bradley	22	27	81%

Non-Unanimous Decisions

Justice	Majority Votes Cast	Total Votes Cast	Percent in Majority
Abrahamson	11	33	33%
A.W. Bradley	11	33	33%
Prosser	26	31	84%
Roggensack	26	33	79%
Ziegler	27	32	84%
Gableman	30	32	94%
R.G. Bradley	17	22	77%

Opinions Authored

This chart indicates how many majority opinions a justice authored in cases decided by each of the four possible majority vote totals.

Opinion Author	7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3 (or 3-2)
Abrahamson	0	0	4	1
A.W. Bradley	2	0	1	2
Prosser	2	1	3	0
Roggensack	0	0	5	1
Ziegler	2	0	2	2
Gableman	1	1	2	1
R.G. Bradley	0	0	7	0

The chart below shows how many concurring and dissenting opinions each justice authored.³

Opinion Author	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions
Abrahamson	5	14
A.W. Bradley	5	9
Prosser	4	5
Roggensack	3	4
Ziegler	6	2
Gableman	0	1
R.G. Bradley	3	4

³ In the rare instance when two justices co-authored a separate opinion, both are credited as authors in this table.

Days Between Oral Argument and Opinion Filing

This table shows the average number of days between oral argument and the filing of majority (or, rarely, lead) opinions authored by each of the justices. Given that a variety of factors could influence the length of time between oral argument and the filing of an opinion in a particular case—including the time taken by other justices to write concurring or dissenting opinions—averages for individual justices should be compared over an extended period.

	Number of Majority/Lead Opinions Authored	Ave. No. of Days From Oral Argument to Opinion Filing
Abrahamson	5	116
A.W. Bradley	5	115
Prosser	6	172
Roggensack	6	138
Ziegler	6	108
Gableman	6	164
R.G. Bradley	7	134

Number of Oral Arguments Presented

The following table displays firms and agencies that participated in at least two oral arguments during the 2015-16 term.⁴

Firms and Agencies	Number of Oral Arguments
Crivello Carlson, S.C.	2
Godfrey & Kahn, S.C.	3
Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP	2
Hupy and Abraham, S.C.	2
Solicitor General's Office	2
Swid Law Offices, LLC	2
State Attorney General's Office	24
State Public Defender's Office	8
von Briesen & Roper, S.C.	2
Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker, LLP	2

⁴ The table includes *State v. Patrick J. Lynch* and two 3-3 *per curiam* decisions (*Yasmine Clark v. American Cyanamid Company* and *New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond*).