

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1	5-2	4-3
47/71 (66%)	12/71 (17%)	5/71 (7%)	7/71 (10%)
<i>State v. Shegrud</i>	<i>State v. Jackson</i>	<i>State v. Griffin</i>	<i>State v. Fry</i>
<i>State v. Carter</i>	<i>Federated Rural Electric Ins. Co. v. Kessler</i>	<i>Mowry v. Badger State Mut. Casualty Co.</i>	<i>Weber v. Cedarburg</i>
<i>State ex rel. Zdanczewicz v. Snyder</i>	<i>Kruse v. Horlamus Industries, Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Williquette</i>	<i>Long v. Long</i>
<i>State v. Smith</i>	<i>Milwaukee Brewers Baseball Club v. Wisconsin Dep't of Health & Social Services</i>	<i>State v. Fishnick</i>	<i>Milwaukee Brewers Baseball Club v. Wisconsin Dep't of Health & Social Services</i>
<i>State ex rel. Brookside Poultry Farms, Inc. v. Jefferson County Bd. of Adjustment</i>	<i>Wandry v. Bull's Eye Credit Union</i>	<i>In re Amendment of Rules of Civil & Criminal Procedure: Sections 971.07 & 971.08, Stats. (5-2, per curiam)</i>	<i>State v. Cissell</i>
<i>State v. Bangert</i>	<i>Burlington Northern, Inc. v. Superior</i>		<i>Betchkal v. Willis</i>
<i>Fleming v. Threshermen's Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Turley</i>		<i>Fish v. Amsted Industries, Inc.</i>
<i>Schumacher v. Schumacher</i>	<i>State v. Davis</i>		
<i>Forsythe v. Family Court Comm'r</i>	<i>In Interest of J.V.R.</i>		
<i>Button v. Button</i>	<i>State v. Tappa</i>		
<i>Levy v. Levy</i>	<i>Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. v. Boeck</i>		
<i>Borello v. U.S. Oil Co.</i>	<i>Lewis v. Coursolle Broadcasting</i>		
<i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Bucyrus-Erie Co.</i>			
<i>Kottka v. PPG Industries, Inc.</i>			
<i>State v. Brady</i>			
<i>Delvaux v. Langenberg</i>			
<i>Wierman v. Wierman</i>			
<i>In Interest of E.C.</i>			
<i>State v. Zelenka</i>			
<i>Oostburg State Bank v. United Sav. & Loan Asso.</i>			
<i>State v. Waalen</i>			
<i>State v. McCrossen</i>			
<i>State v. Danforth</i>			
<i>Geneva v. Tills</i>			
<i>State v. Disch</i>			
<i>North Side Bank v. Gentile</i>			
<i>State v. Heffran</i>			
<i>Crest Chevrolet-Oldsmobile-Cadillac, Inc. v. Willemsen</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.

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 1985-1986

<i>Vogt v. Schroeder</i>			
<i>Bingenheimer v. Wisconsin Dep't of Health & Social Services</i>			
<i>Clarmar Realty Co. v. Redevelopment Authority of Milwaukee</i>			
<i>Harmann v. Hadley</i>			
<i>Waukesha v. Salbashian</i>			
<i>State v. Worgull</i>			
<i>State v. Nordness</i>			
<i>State v. Saternus</i>			
<i>State v. Minniecheske</i>			
<i>Steinke v. Steinke</i>			
<i>Robert Hansen Trucking, Inc. v. Labor & Industry Review Com., Dep't of Industry, Labor & Human Relations</i>			
<i>Koenings v. Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co.</i>			
<i>State, Dep't of Industry, Labor & Human Relations v. Coatings, Inc.</i>			
<i>Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Dist. v. Wisconsin Dep't of Natural Resources</i>			
<i>Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc. v. State Dep't of Natural Resources</i>			
<i>Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc. v. State Dep't of Natural Resources (7-0, per curiam)</i>			
<i>State v. Bauer (7-0, per curiam)</i>			
<i>In re Paternity of B.W.S. (6-0)</i>			
<i>Kramer v. Horton (6-0)</i>			