

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1, 4-1)	5-2	4-3
56/83 (67%)	13/83 (16%)	8/83 (10%)	6/83 (7%)
<i>Hogan v. Musolf</i>	<i>State v. Weber</i>	<i>In re Interest of Z.J.H.</i>	<i>State v. Seibel</i>
<i>In Interest of K.D.J.</i>	<i>Benjamin Plumbing, Inc. v. Barnes</i>	<i>In Interest of R.W.S.</i>	<i>State v. Martin</i>
<i>State ex rel. Serocki v. Circuit Court for Clark County</i>	<i>Monson v. Madison Family Inst.</i>	<i>Koestler v. Pollard</i>	<i>Voss v. Middleton</i>
<i>State v. Milashoski</i>	<i>Schneller v. St. Mary's Hosp. Medical Center</i>	<i>State v. Webb</i>	<i>Smith v. County of Milwaukee</i>
<i>State v. Pasko</i>	<i>Nichols v. Nichols</i>	<i>Ford v. Kenosha County</i>	<i>State v. Daniels</i>
<i>In Interest of J.A.L.</i>	<i>State v. Whitrock</i>	<i>Milwaukee v. Wroten</i>	<i>State v. Rewolinski</i>
<i>State v. Higginbotham</i>	<i>Thompson v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>Hennekens v. Hoerl</i>	
<i>Hommel v. Hommel</i>	<i>Loveridge v. Chartier</i>	<i>Keane v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>Oakley v. Fireman's Fund of Wisconsin</i>	<i>State v. Noll</i>		
<i>Madison v. Baumann</i>	<i>Lightcap v. Steenberg Homes, Inc.</i>		
<i>Miller Brands-Milwaukee, Inc. v. Case</i>	<i>Ervin v. Kenosha</i>		
<i>State v. R.R.E.</i>	<i>State v. Lindh (5-1)</i>		
<i>In Interest of B.J.N.</i>	<i>Saenz v. Murphy (4-1)</i>		
<i>In re S.Y.</i>			
<i>Arndorfer v. Sauk County Bd. of Adjustment</i>			
<i>In re Guardianship of R.S.</i>			
<i>Johnson v. Allis Chalmers Corp.</i>			
<i>Maleki v. Fine-Lando Clinic Chartered, S.C.</i>			
<i>Mayfair Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc. v. Baldarotta</i>			
<i>State v. Rollfink</i>			
<i>State v. Newman</i>			
<i>Kolpin v. Pioneer Power & Light Co.</i>			
<i>Employers Health Ins. v. General Casualty Co.</i>			
<i>In re Paternity of C.A.S.</i>			
<i>In re Estate of Barthel</i>			
<i>State v. Canedy</i>			
<i>State v. Petrone</i>			
<i>Dobratz v. Thomson</i>			
<i>Milwaukee Rescue Mission v. Redevelopment Auth.</i>			
<i>Clark v. Erdmann</i>			

(continued on following page)

¹ In few instances, a justice authored a separate opinion that concurred in part and dissented in part. For this and other tables, 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.

<i>Jenson v. Employers Mut. Casualty Co.</i>			
<i>Lang v. Lang</i>			
<i>Department of Industry, Labor & Human Relations v. Labor & Industry Review Com.</i>			
<i>Nelson v. Nelson Hardware</i>			
<i>State v. Kuntz</i>			
<i>Wisconsin Dairies Coop. v. Citizens Bank & Trust</i>			
<i>Hauboldt v. Union Carbide Corp.</i>			
<i>State v. Miller</i>			
<i>Griebler v. Doughboy Recreational, Inc.</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Chiarkas v. Skow</i>			
<i>Wrigley v. Department of Revenue</i>			
<i>State v. Livingston</i>			
<i>Johnson v. Calado</i>			
<i>State v. Rachwal</i>			
<i>Burlington N. R. Co. v. Superior</i>			
<i>Gansch v. Nekoosa Papers, Inc.</i>			
<i>Cleaver v. Department of Revenue</i>			
<i>In Interest of D.W.B.</i>			
<i>State v. Myers</i>			
<i>State v. Waites</i>			
<i>Tobler v. Door County</i>			
<i>Milwaukee v. Greenberg (6-0)</i>			
<i>Northridge Co. v. W.R. Grace & Co. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Farm Credit Bank of Saint Paul v. Lord (6-0)</i>			
<i>In Interest of A.E.H. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Rolph v. EBI Cos. (6-0)</i>			