

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

7-0 (or 4-0, 5-0, 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
29 (48%)	8 (13%)	19 (32%)	4 (7%)
<i>Milwaukee Journal Sentinel v. City of Milwaukee</i>	<i>Michael J. Waldvogel Trucking, LLC v. State Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>	<i>Wis. Pub. Serv. Corp. v. Arby Constr., Inc.</i>	<i>Jandre v. Wis. Injured Patients &amp; Families Comp. Fund</i>
<i>State v. Miller</i>	<i>Marquez v. Mercedes-Benz United States, LLC</i>	<i>Wisconsin v. Gilbert</i>	<i>Maxwell v. Hartford Union High Sch. Dist.</i>
<i>State v. Martin</i>	<i>Heritage Farms, Inc. v. Markel Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Felix</i>	<i>Gister v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>State v. Sellhausen</i>	<i>May v. May</i>	<i>Wis. Indus. Energy Group v. PSC of Wis.</i>	<i>Crown Castle USA, Inc. v. Orion Constr. Group, LLC</i>
<i>State v. Nielsen</i>	<i>State v. Spaeth</i>	<i>DeBruin v. St. Patrick Congregation</i>	
<i>Brenner v. New Richmond Reg'l Airport Comm'n &amp; New Richmond</i>	<i>State v. Stevens</i>	<i>Weborg v. Jenny</i>	
<i>Wis. Dolls, LLC v. Town of Dell Prairie</i>	<i>State v. Hanson</i>	<i>State v. Ziegler</i>	
<i>State v. Frey</i>	<i>Aurora Consol. Health Care &amp; Sentry Ins. v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Soto</i>	
<i>Kroner v. Oneida Seven Generations Corp.</i>		<i>State v. Negrete</i>	
<i>Lamar Co., LLC v. Country Side Rest.</i>		<i>Best Price Plumbing, Inc. v. Erie Ins. Exch.</i>	
<i>Aldrich v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>		<i>State v. Smith</i>	
<i>State v. Cain</i>		<i>Adams v. State Livestock Facilities Siting Review Bd.</i>	
<i>State v. Rowan</i>		<i>Hirschhorn v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>State v. Sutton</i>		<i>Wadzinski v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>State v. Goss</i>		<i>State v. Dinkins</i>	
<i>Orlowski v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>Estate of Kriefall v. Sizzler United States Franchise, Inc.</i>	
<i>State v. Domke</i>		<i>State v. Tyler T. (4-2)</i>	
<i>Olson v. Farrar</i>		<i>State v. Dowdy (4-2)</i>	
<i>Admiral Ins. Co. v. Paper Converting Mach. Co.</i>		<i>Johnson v. Cintas Corp. No. 2 (4-2)</i>	
<i>260 N. 12th St., LLC v. State DOT</i>			

(continued on following page)

<sup>1</sup> In seven cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*MBS-Certified Public Accountants* [Prosser, Gableman]; *Estate of Kriefall* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Stevens* [Abrahamson]; *Weborg* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Wis. Public Service Corp.* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Ziegler* [Abrahamson, Bradley]; *Marquez* [Roggensack]). For this table, and those that follow, each of these votes was 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.

<i>State v. Thompson</i>
<i>In the Matter of the Rehab. of: Segregated Account of Ambac Assurance Corp. (6-0)</i>
<i>Zwiefelhofer v. Town of Cooks Valley (6-0)</i>
<i>Fond du Lac County v. Helen E.F. (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Ryan (6-0)</i>
<i>MBS-Certified Pub. Accountants, LLC v. Wis. Bell, Inc. (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Anagnos (5-0)</i>
<i>State v. Williams (5-0)</i>
<i>State v. Abbott Labs (4-0)</i>