

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

<b>7-0 (or 6-0)</b>	<b>6-1 (or 5-1)</b>	<b>5-2</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>22 (38%)</b>	<b>5 (9%)</b>	<b>23 (40%)</b>	<b>8 (14%)<sup>2</sup></b>
<i>State ex rel. Stupar River LLC v. Town of Linwood</i>	<i>Covenant Healthcare Sys. v. City of Wauwatosa</i>	<i>State v. Nordberg</i>	<i>Madison Metro. Sch. Dist. v. Circuit Court</i>
<i>Portage County Bd. of Review</i>			
<i>Northern Air Servs. v. Link</i>	<i>Dawson v. Town of Jackson</i>	<i>State v. West</i>	<i>State v. Funk</i>
<i>State v. Denson</i>	<i>Bushard v. Reisman</i>	<i>State v. Balliette</i>	<i>Siebert v. Wis. Am. Mut. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>McReath v. McReath</i>	<i>State v. Burris</i>	<i>State v. Kandutsch</i>	<i>Day v. Allstate Indem. Co.</i>
<i>State v. Gonzalez</i>	<i>State v. Carter (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Rhodes</i>	<i>State v. Forbush</i>
<i>Lake Beulah Mgmt. Dist. v. E. Troy</i>		<i>E-Z Roll Off, LLC v. County of Oneida</i>	<i>Metro. Assocs. v. City of Milwaukee</i>
<i>Lake Beulah Mgmt. Dist. v. State Dep't of Natural Res.</i>		<i>deBoer Transp., Inc. v. Swenson</i>	<i>State ex rel. Ozanne v. Fitzgerald</i>
<i>Rasmussen v. GMC</i>		<i>Steffens v. BlueCross BlueShield</i>	<i>Tews v. NHI, LLC</i>
<i>State v. Buchanan</i>		<i>Topolski v. Topolski</i>	
<i>Brethorst v. Allstate Prop. &amp; Cas. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>Affeldt v. Green Lake County</i>	
<i>Klemm v. Am. Transmission Co., LLC</i>		<i>State v. Lamar</i>	
<i>Foley-Ciccantelli v. Bishop's Grove Condo. Ass'n</i>		<i>State v. St. Martin</i>	
<i>Emjay Inv. Co. v. Village of Germantown</i>		<i>Fischer v. Steffen</i>	
<i>State v. Harbor</i>		<i>State v. Ninham</i>	
<i>State v. Beauchamp</i>		<i>Tammy W-G. v. Jacob T.</i>	
<i>Ottman v. Town of Primrose</i>		<i>State v. Burns</i>	
<i>Brown County Dep't of Human Servs. v. Brenda B.</i>		<i>Andersen v. Dep't of Natural Res.</i>	
<i>Peter Boerst v. Mark Henn</i>		<i>State v. Marinez</i>	
<i>Nestlé USA, Inc. v. Wis. Dep't of Revenue</i>		<i>State v. Conner</i>	
<i>State v. Patterson</i>		<i>Jackson v. Buchler</i>	
<i>Kilian v. Mercedes-Benz United States, LLC (6-0)</i>		<i>Town Bank v. City Real Estate Dev., LLC</i>	
<i>BNP Paribas v. Olsen's Mill, Inc. (6-0)</i>		<i>Casper v. Am. Int'l S. Ins. Co.</i>	
		<i>Werner v. Hendree</i>	

<sup>1</sup> In four cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*Casper* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Ozanne* [Abrahamson, Bradley, Crooks]; *Werner* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Tews* [Crooks, Ziegler, Gableman]). These “split votes” were 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. In a few instances the dividing line between a dissent and a concurrence is exceedingly thin, and views might reasonably differ as to the opinion’s proper classification. However, such ambiguous opinions amount to only a handful of the hundreds of votes cast, and thus they have a negligible effect on the tables presented here.

<sup>2</sup> The percents do not add up to 100 because of rounding.