

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0, 5-0)	6-1	5-2	4-3
52/71 (73%)	10/71 (14%)	4/71 (6%)	5/71 (7%)
<i>Olson v. Connerly</i>	<i>Wisconsin Educ. Ass'n Council v. State Elections Bd.</i>	<i>State v. Louis</i>	<i>State v. Moats</i>
<i>State v. Richardson</i>	<i>Just v. Land Reclamation, Ltd.</i>	<i>State v. Heyn</i>	<i>Van Susteren v. Department of Revenue</i>
<i>Vollmer v. Luety</i>	<i>Schulz v. Ystad</i>	<i>State ex rel. Morke v. Donnelly</i>	<i>State v. McNeil</i>
<i>Fletcher v. Eagle River Memorial Hosp., Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Murdock</i>	<i>State v. Walker</i>	<i>Mortier v. Casey</i>
<i>State v. Behnke</i>	<i>State v. DeSmidt</i>		<i>State v. Burke</i>
<i>Smith v. Atlantic Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State ex rel. Fiedler v. Wisconsin Senate</i>		
<i>State v. DeSantis</i>	<i>Drivers, Salesmen, etc. Local No. 695 v. Labor & Industry Review Com.</i>		
<i>State ex rel. Journal/Sentinel, Inc. v. Pleva</i>	<i>State v. Seifert</i>		
<i>Humana Medical Corp. v. Peyer</i>	<i>Raby v. Moe</i>		
<i>Bank of Sun Prairie v. Esser</i>	<i>N.N. v. Moraine Mut. Ins. Co.</i>		
<i>Rineck v. Johnson</i>			
<i>Peissig v. Wisconsin Gas Co.</i>			
<i>Nelson v. Davidson</i>			
<i>State v. Pulizzano</i>			
<i>State v. Weide</i>			
<i>Anderson v. Onsager</i>			
<i>State v. Eichman</i>			
<i>In re Protective Placement of D.E.R.</i>			
<i>State v. Lemay</i>			
<i>GTE Sprint Communications Corp. v. Wisconsin Bell, Inc.</i>			
<i>Abitz v. Abitz</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Girouard v. Circuit Court</i>			
<i>State v. Anderson</i>			
<i>Ehlinger v. Sipes</i>			
<i>In Interest of C.A.K.</i>			
<i>In re Guardianship of F.E.H.</i>			
<i>Kemp v. Miller</i>			
<i>American Medical Transport, Inc. v. Curtis-Universal, Inc.</i>			
<i>State v. McQuay</i>			
<i>Kocinski v. Home Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Poellinger</i>			
<i>In Interest of A.L.W.</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>State ex rel. Collins v. American Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Flood v. Lomira, Bd. of Review</i>			
<i>Mullen v. Coolong</i>			
<i>Eby v. Kozarek</i>			
<i>Marciniak v. Lundborg</i>			
<i>Order to Pay Attorneys Fees in State v. Newman</i>			
<i>Energy Complexes, Inc. v. Eau Claire County</i>			
<i>Schulz v. Nienhuis</i>			
<i>State v. Schultz</i>			
<i>State v. McManus</i>			
<i>State ex rel. N.R.Z. v. G.L.C.</i>			
<i>Gard v. State Elections Bd. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Scott v. First State Ins. Co. (6-0)</i>			
<i>In re Marriage of Soergel (6-0)</i>			
<i>Employers Ins. of Wausau v. Smith (6-0)</i>			
<i>In re Interest of M.P. (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Johnson (6-0)</i>			
<i>In Interest of W.P. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Colonial Bank v. Marine Bank, N.A. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Schmidt v. Employee Trust Funds Bd. (5-0)</i>			