

STATISTICS ON WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 2024-25

Four-to-Three Decisions

4-3 Alignments

Justices	Total	Case Names
A.W. Bradley, Dallet, Karofsky, Protasiewicz	4	<i>Kenneth Brown v. Wisconsin Elections Commission; Jeffery A. LeMieux v. Tony Evers; Josh Kaul v. Joel Urmanski; and Tony Evers v. Howard Marklein</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	0
Ziegler	0
R.G. Bradley	0
Dallet	1
Hagedorn	0
Karofsky	3
Protasiewicz	0
Total	4

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0	6-1	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
8/22 (36%)	3/22 (14%)	7/22 (32%)	4/22 (18%)
<i>Wisconsin Elections Commission v. Devin LeMahieu</i>	<i>State v. Kordell L. Grady</i>	<i>Wisconsin Voter Alliance v. Kristina Secord</i>	<i>Kenneth Brown v. Wisconsin Elections Commission</i>
<i>State v. H. C.</i>	<i>Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections v. Brian Hayes</i>	<i>Hayden Halter v. Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association</i>	<i>Jeffery A. LeMieux v. Tony Evers</i>
<i>State v. Jobert L. Molde</i>	<i>State v. Joan L. Stetzer</i>	<i>Oconomowoc Area School District v. Gregory L. Cota</i>	<i>Josh Kaul v. Joel Urmanski, as DA for Sheboygan County, WI</i>
<i>Josh Kaul v. Wisconsin State Legislature</i>		<i>Melissa A. Hubbard v. Carol J. Neuman, MD</i>	<i>Tony Evers v. Howard Marklein</i>
<i>Wisconsin State Legislature v. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction</i>		<i>Nicole McDaniel v. Wisconsin Department of Corrections</i>	
<i>State v. Luis A. Ramirez</i>		<i>Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, Inc. v. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</i>	
<i>Service Employees International Union Healthcare Wisconsin v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission</i>		<i>Karen Elizabeth Morway v. David Seth Morway [4-2]</i>	
<i>State v. Carl Lee McAdory</i>			

¹ 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. 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	22	22	100%
Ziegler	11	21	52%
R.G. Bradley	10	22	45%
Dallet	22	22	100%
Hagedorn	17	22	77%
Karofsky	22	22	100%
Protasiewicz	20	22	91%

Non-Unanimous Decisions

Justice	Majority Votes Cast	Total Votes Cast	Percent in Majority
A.W. Bradley	14	14	100%
Ziegler	3	13	23%
R.G. Bradley	2	14	14%
Dallet	14	14	100%
Hagedorn	9	14	64%
Karofsky	14	14	100%
Protasiewicz	12	14	86%

Opinions Authored

This chart indicates how many majority/lead opinions a justice authored in cases decided by each of the four possible majority vote totals.

Opinion Author	7-0	6-1	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
A.W. Bradley	0	1	2	0
Ziegler	1	1	0	0
R.G. Bradley	3	0	0	0
Dallet	1	1	1	1
Hagedorn	3	0	1	0
Karofsky	0	0	0	3
Protasiewicz	0	0	3	0

The chart below shows how many concurring and dissenting opinions each justice authored.²

Opinion Author	Concurring Opinions	Dissenting Opinions
A.W. Bradley	3	0
Ziegler	3	7
R.G. Bradley	2	7
Dallet	5	0
Hagedorn	2	4
Karofsky	3	0
Protasiewicz	2	2

² As explained in the “Vote Split” table, 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.

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 54%.

Agreement Among Pairs of Justices—All Cases

	Ziegler	R. Bradley	Dallet	Hagedorn	Karofsky	Protasiewicz
A. Bradley	11/21=52%	10/22=45%	22/22=100%	17/22=77%	22/22=100%	20/22=91%
	Ziegler	20/21=95%	11/21=52%	15/21=71%	11/21=52%	9/21=43%
		R. Bradley	10/22=45%	15/22=68%	10/22=45%	8/22=36%
			Dallet	17/22=77%	22/22=100%	20/22=91%
				Hagedorn	17/22=77%	15/22=68%
					Karofsky	20/22=91%
						Protasiewicz

Agreement Among Pairs of Justices—Non-Unanimous Cases

	Ziegler	R. Bradley	Dallet	Hagedorn	Karofsky	Protasiewicz
A. Bradley	3/13=23%	2/14=14%	14/14=100%	9/14=64%	14/14=100%	12/14=86%
	Ziegler	12/13=92%	3/13=23%	7/13=54%	3/13=23%	1/13=8%
		R. Bradley	2/14=14%	7/14=50%	2/14=14%	0/14=0%
			Dallet	9/14=64%	14/14=100%	12/14=86%
				Hagedorn	9/14=64%	7/14=50%
					Karofsky	12/14=86%
						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.

The average for all 22 decisions was **137 days**.

	Number of Majority/Lead Opinions Authored	Ave. No. of Days From Oral Argument to Opinion Filing
A.W. Bradley	3	120
Ziegler	2	77
R.G. Bradley	3	132
Dallet	4	175
Hagedorn	4	121
Karofsky	3	175
Protasiewicz	3	131

Number of Oral Arguments Presented

The following table displays firms and agencies that delivered at least two oral arguments during the 2024-25 term.

Firms and Agencies	Number of Oral Arguments
Pines Bach	3
State Attorney General's Office	15
State Public Defender's Office	3
Troutman Pepper	3
Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty	2