

Four-to-Three Decisions¹

4-3 Alignments

Justices	Total	Case Names
Prosser, Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman	5	<i>Tatera v. FMC Corp.</i> ; <i>State v. Henley</i> ; <i>State v. Imani</i> ; <i>Sands v. Menard</i> ; <i>Soc’y Ins. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm’n</i>
Abrahamson, Bradley, Crooks, Gableman	1	<i>State v. Carter</i>
Abrahamson, Bradley, Crooks, Prosser	1	<i>Johnson Controls, Inc. v. London Mkt.</i>
Abrahamson, Crooks, Prosser, Ziegler	1	<i>Pries v. McMillon</i>
Crooks, Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman	1	<i>State v. Pinkard</i>

4-3 Membership in the Majority

Justice	Votes
Abrahamson	3
Bradley	2
Crooks	4
Prosser	7
Roggensack	6
Ziegler	7
Gableman	7

4-3 Majority Opinions Authored

Justice	Opinions
Abrahamson	1
Bradley	1
Crooks	1
Prosser	0
Roggensack	2
Ziegler	2
Gableman	2
Total	9

¹ In two of these 4-3 cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*State v. Carter* [Roggensack]; and *State v. Imani* [Crooks, Abrahamson, Bradley]). Given that the opinion of each of these justices dissented from the majority result on at least one issue, all were classified as dissents. If an opinion had concurred with the result on all issues, but disputed the majority’s reasoning, it would have been classified as a concurrence. See the note accompanying the table titled “Decisions by Vote Split” for a complete listing of decisions that included a concurrence in part and dissent in part.