

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 5-0)	6-1	5-2	4-3
60/83 (72%)	11/83 (13%)	6/83 (7%)	6/83 (7%)
<i>State v. Sayles</i>	<i>Emery v. Emery</i>	<i>State v. Dyess</i>	<i>State v. Leach</i>
<i>State v. Bolstad</i>	<i>State v. Wyss</i>	<i>Fobes v. Fobes</i>	<i>State ex rel. Newspapers, Inc. v. Circuit Court for Milwaukee County</i>
<i>Brown County v. Labor & Industry Review Com.</i>	<i>Brown v. Maxey</i>	<i>State v. Kramsvogel</i>	<i>In re Estate of Graef</i>
<i>State v. Ludwig</i>	<i>State ex rel. Hoover v. Gagnon</i>	<i>County of Vilas v. Chapman</i>	<i>State v. Stevens</i>
<i>State v. D'Acquisto</i>	<i>State v. Beaudry</i>	<i>Cunningham v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Douglas</i>
<i>State v. Pitsch</i>	<i>State v. Caibaosai</i>	<i>State v. Wilks</i>	<i>Evans v. Cameron</i>
<i>Madison General Hospital v. Haack</i>	<i>Garrett v. City of New Berlin</i>		
<i>State ex rel. Hennekens v. River Falls Police & Fire Com.</i>	<i>Tahtinen v. MSI Ins. Co.</i>		
<i>Lundin v. Shimanski</i>	<i>Welch v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>		
<i>State v. Beets</i>	<i>Les Moise, Inc. v. Rossignol Ski Co.</i>		
<i>State v. Cecchini</i>	<i>Sumnicht v. Toyota Motor Sales, Inc.</i>		
<i>Krueger v. Wisconsin Dep't of Revenue</i>			
<i>Schroeder v. Register Pub. Corp.</i>			
<i>Ferraro v. Koelsch</i>			
<i>State v. Cegielski</i>			
<i>In Interest of C.E.W.</i>			
<i>Neylan v. Vorwald</i>			
<i>Manor v. Hanson</i>			
<i>Teigen v. Jelco of Wisconsin, Inc.</i>			
<i>State v. Mann</i>			
<i>Koback v. Crook</i>			
<i>State v. Hartwig</i>			
<i>State v. Mauthe</i>			
<i>DeMars v. LaPour</i>			
<i>In re Estate of Trotalli</i>			
<i>State v. Richards</i>			
<i>Bell v. Elkhorn</i>			
<i>Quinn v. Dodgeville</i>			
<i>State ex rel. M.L.B v. D.G.H.</i>			
<i>State v. Repp</i>			

(continued on following page)

¹ As a result of rounding, the percentages do not add up to one hundred. 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, 1984-1985

<i>State v. Lee</i>			
<i>State v. Flattum</i>			
<i>Evans v. W.E.A. Ins. Trust</i>			
<i>Lutzke v. Lutzke</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Watts v. Combined Community Services Bd.</i>			
<i>Helmbrecht v. St. Paul Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State, Dep't of Employment Relations v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Com.</i>			
<i>Wisconsin Patients Compensation Fund v. Continental Casualty Co.</i>			
<i>In re Estate of Parsons</i>			
<i>In Interest of N.E.</i>			
<i>State v. Martin</i>			
<i>Brantner v. Jenson</i>			
<i>State v. O'Neill</i>			
<i>Wozniak v. Wozniak</i>			
<i>State v. Dunn</i>			
<i>Sacotte v. Ideal-Werk Krug & Priester Maschinen-Fabrik</i>			
<i>Stivarius v. Di Vall</i>			
<i>Figgs v. Milwaukee</i>			
<i>State v. McConohie</i>			
<i>Gross v. Lloyds of London Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Denter</i>			
<i>School Dist. v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Com.</i>			
<i>West Bend Education Asso. v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Com.</i>			
<i>State v. Hamilton</i>			
<i>American Family Mut. Ins. Co. v. Shannon</i>			
<i>Nigbor v. Department of Industry, Labor & Human Relations</i>			
<i>Bell v. Labor & Industry Review Com.</i>			
<i>In re Condemnation by Redevelopment Authority</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Palleon v. Musolf (5-0)</i>			
<i>Anchor Sav. & Loan Asso. v. Equal Opportunities Com. (5-0)</i>			