

STATISTICS ON WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 2023-24

Four-to-Three Decisions

4-3 Alignments

Justices	Total	Case Names
A.W. Bradley, Dallet, Karofsky, Protasiewicz	4	<i>Rebecca Clarke v. Wisconsin Elections Commission; Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc. v. State of Wisconsin Labor and Industry Review Commission; Sojenhomer LLC v. Village of Egg Harbor; and Priorities USA v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</i>

Membership in the Majority

Justice	Votes
A.W. Bradley	4
Ziegler	0
R.G. Bradley	0
Dallet	4
Hagedorn	0
Karofsky	4
Protasiewicz	4

Majority Opinions Authored

Justice	Opinions
A.W. Bradley	2
Ziegler	0
R.G. Bradley	0
Dallet	1
Hagedorn	0
Karofsky	1
Protasiewicz	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>

Decisions by Vote Split<sup>1</sup>

<b>7-0</b>	<b>6-1</b>	<b>5-2</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>4/14 (29%)</b>	<b>3/14 (21%)</b>	<b>3/14 (21%)</b>	<b>4/14 (29%)</b>
<i>A. M. B. v. Circuit Court for Ashland County</i>	<i>Antonio S. Davis v. Circuit Court for Dane County</i>	<i>Erik A. Andrade v. City of Milwaukee Board of Fire and Police Commissioners</i>	<i>Rebecca Clarke v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</i>
<i>Nancy Kindschy v. Brian Aish</i>	<i>State v. Michael Gene Wiskowski</i>	<i>State v. R. A. M.</i>	<i>Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc. v. State of Wisconsin Labor and Industry Review Commission</i>
<i>State v. B. W.</i>	<i>Tony Evers v. Howard Marklein</i>	<i>Waukesha County v. M.A.C.</i>	<i>Sojenhomer LLC v. Village of Egg Harbor</i>
<i>Dean Phillips v. Wisconsin Elections Commission (per curiam)</i>			<i>Priorities USA v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</i>

---

<sup>1</sup> Occasionally, a justice will author a separate opinion that concurs in part and dissents in part. For SCOWstats tables, each such vote is 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.

Frequency in the Majority

These charts display how frequently each justice voted in the majority in decisions filed during the 2023-24 term. The first chart includes all cases in which a justice voted, while the second chart includes only cases decided by split votes.

## All Cases

Justice	Majority Votes Cast	Total Votes Cast	Percent in Majority
A.W. Bradley	14	14	<b>100%</b>
Ziegler	4	14	<b>29%</b>
R.G. Bradley	8	14	<b>57%</b>
Dallet	14	14	<b>100%</b>
Hagedorn	9	14	<b>64%</b>
Karofsky	14	14	<b>100%</b>
Protasiewicz	14	14	<b>100%</b>

## Non-Unanimous Decisions

Justice	Majority Votes Cast	Total Votes Cast	Percent in Majority
A.W. Bradley	10	10	<b>100%</b>
Ziegler	0	10	<b>0%</b>
R.G. Bradley	4	10	<b>40%</b>
Dallet	10	10	<b>100%</b>
Hagedorn	5	10	<b>50%</b>
Karofsky	10	10	<b>100%</b>
Protasiewicz	10	10	<b>100%</b>

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	6-1	5-2	4-3
A.W. Bradley	0	0	0	2
Ziegler	1	0	0	0
R.G. Bradley	1	1	0	0
Dallet	1	0	0	1
Hagedorn	0	1	1	0
Karofsky	0	0	1	1
Protasiewicz	0	1	1	0

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

Opinion Author	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions
A.W. Bradley	2	0
Ziegler	1	8
R.G. Bradley	4	4
Dallet	2	0
Hagedorn	3	2
Karofsky	1	0
Protasiewicz	1	0

Agreement Among Pairs of Justices

The following tables show the percentage of cases in which every possible pair of justices found themselves on the same side in a decision—either both in the majority or both dissenting. The first table covers all cases; the second table narrows its focus to cases in which decisions were not unanimous. When reading the *second* table, for instance, one finds that Justices Dallet and Karofsky voted together in 100% of the cases, while the figure for Justices Ziegler and Hagedorn was 50%.

Agreement Among Pairs of Justices—All Cases

	Ziegler	R. Bradley	Dallet	Hagedorn	Karofsky	Protasiewicz
A. Bradley	4/14=29%	8/14=57%	14/14=100%	9/14=64%	14/14=100%	14/14=100%
Ziegler		10/14=71%	4/14=29%	9/14=64%	4/14=29%	4/14=29%
R. Bradley			8/14=57%	11/14=79%	8/14=57%	8/14=57%
Dallet				9/14=64%	14/14=100%	14/14=100%
Hagedorn					9/14=64%	9/14=64%
Karofsky						14/14=100%
Protasiewicz						

Agreement Among Pairs of Justices—Non-Unanimous Cases

	Ziegler	R. Bradley	Dallet	Hagedorn	Karofsky	Protasiewicz
A. Bradley	0/10=0%	4/10=40%	10/10=100%	5/10=50%	10/10=100%	10/10=100%
Ziegler		6/10=60%	0/10=0%	5/10=50%	0/10=0%	0/10=0%
R. Bradley			4/10=40%	7/10=70%	4/10=40%	4/10=40%
Dallet				5/10=50%	10/10=100%	10/10=100%
Hagedorn					5/10=50%	5/10=50%
Karofsky						10/10=100%
Protasiewicz						

Days Between Oral Argument and Opinion Filing

This table shows the average number of days between oral argument and the filing of majority 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.

	<b>Number of Majority Opinions Authored</b>	<b>Ave. No. of Days From Oral Argument to Opinion Filing</b>
A.W. Bradley	2	119
Ziegler	1	100
R.G. Bradley	2	156
Dallet	2	142
Hagedorn	2	175
Karofsky	2	92
Protasiewicz	2	133

Number of Oral Arguments Presented

The following table displays firms and agencies that participated in at least two oral arguments during the 2023-24 term.

<b>Firms and Agencies</b>	<b>Number of Oral Arguments</b>
Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee	2
Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office	2
Pines Bach	2
Stafford Rosenbaum	2
State Attorney General's Office	7
State Public Defender's Office	4
Troutman Pepper	2