

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

7-0 (or 6-0, 5-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3 (or 3-2)
41 (48%)	9 (10%)	20 (23%)	16 (19%)
<i>State v. Kramer</i>	<i>Peterson v. Midwest Sec. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Raflik</i>	<i>State v. Williams</i>
<i>State v. Tye</i>	<i>State v. Samuel</i>	<i>State ex rel. Hass v. Wis. Court of Appeals</i>	<i>Mau v. North Dakota Ins. Reserve Fund</i>
<i>State v. Nichols</i>	<i>State v. Nollie</i>	<i>State v. Schwebke</i>	<i>Dodgeland Educ. Ass'n v. Wis. Empl. Rels. Comm'n</i>
<i>State v. Davis</i>	<i>State v. Anderson</i>	<i>Stephenson v. Universal Metrics</i>	<i>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Gillette</i>
<i>Auman v. School District</i>	<i>State v. Noble</i>	<i>State v. Delao</i>	<i>Knight v. Milwaukee County (In re Muriel K.)</i>
<i>State v. Dunlap</i>	<i>Stehlik v. Rhoads</i>	<i>State v. Trochinski</i>	<i>State v. Jennings</i>
<i>Pasko v. City of Milwaukee</i>	<i>Tri-Tech Corp. of Am. v. Americomp Servs.</i>	<i>State v. St. George</i>	<i>Lane v. Sharp Packaging Sys.</i>
<i>Ahrens v. Town of Fulton</i>	<i>State v. Polashek</i>	<i>State v. Krajewski</i>	<i>Schaefer v. Riegelman</i>
<i>State v. Rizzo</i>	<i>Bd. of Regents v. State Pers. Comm'n (5-1)</i>	<i>Lodl v. Progressive N. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Veach</i>
<i>Manitowoc W. Co. v. Montonen</i>		<i>State v. Harvey</i>	<i>Dunn County v. Judy K. (in Re Judy K.)</i>
<i>Yocherer v. Farmers Ins. Exch.</i>		<i>Ocasio v. Froedtert Mem'l Lutheran Hosp.</i>	<i>Burg v. Cincinnati Cas. Ins. Co.</i>
<i>World Wide Prosthetic Supply v. Mikulsky</i>		<i>State v. Tomlinson</i>	<i>State v. Vorburger</i>
<i>Indus. to Indus., Inc. v. Hillsman Modular Molding, Inc.</i>		<i>State v. Saunders</i>	<i>Bammert v. Don's SuperValu</i>
<i>Martin v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>State v. Williams</i>	<i>Vill. Food &amp; Liquor Mart v. H &amp; S Petroleum</i>
<i>State v. Robinson</i>		<i>Split Rock Hardwoods v. Lumber Liquidators</i>	<i>Badger Mut. Ins. Co. v. Schmitz</i>
<i>State ex rel. Haas v. McReynolds</i>		<i>State v. Davis</i>	<i>Mallo v. Wis. Dep't of Revenue (3-2)</i>
<i>Jones v. Secura Ins. Co.</i>		<i>ABKA P'Ship v. Wis. Dep't of Natural Res. (4-2)</i>	
<i>State v. Williams</i>		<i>State v. Laxton (in Re Laxton) (4-2)</i>	
<i>Kitten v. State Dep't of Workforce Dev.</i>		<i>State v. Rachel (in Re Rachel) (4-2)</i>	
<i>State v. Gonzales</i>		<i>State v. Keding (In re Keding) (4-2)</i>	

(continued on following page)

<sup>1</sup> In four of these cases (which do not include *Putnam v. Time Warner Cable of Southeastern Wisconsin*, as noted above), there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part (*State v. Williams* [Wilcox, Crooks, and Sykes]; *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Gillette* [Wilcox]; *Tri-Tech Corp. of Am. v. Americomp Services* [Wilcox]; and *Vill. Food & Liquor Mart v. H & S Petroleum* [Wilcox, Crooks, and Sykes]). For this table, and those to come, 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. Accordingly, the votes in the four cases listed above have been classified as dissents.

<i>State v. Head</i>
<i>State v. Douangmala</i>
<i>Vidal v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>Linzmeier v. Forcey</i>
<i>State v. Dennis H. (In re Dennis H.)</i>
<i>State v. Vairin M. (In re Vairin M.)</i>
<i>Jones v. Estate of Jones</i>
<i>Sheboygan County HHS v. Julie A.B. (In re Prestin T.B.)</i>
<i>State v. Sorenson (In re Sorenson)</i>
<i>State v. Green</i>
<i>State v. Leitner</i>
<i>Ruckel v. Gassner</i>
<i>State v. Robins</i>
<i>State v. Multaler (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Watkins (6-0)</i>
<i>Physicians Plus Ins. Corp. v. Midwest Mut. Ins. Co. (6-0)</i>
<i>Osborn v. Bd. of Regents (6-0)</i>
<i>Bruzas v. Quezada-Garcia (7-0 per curiam)</i>
<i>Jensen v. Wisconsin Elections Board (7-0 per curiam)</i>
<i>Norquist v. Zeuske (6-0 per curiam)</i>
<i>State v. Shuttlesworth (5-0 per curiam)</i>