

Decisions by Vote Split¹

7-0 (or 6-0)	6-1 (or 5-1)	5-2 (or 4-2)	4-3
56/79 (71%)	7/79 (9%)	9/79 (11%)	7/79 (9%)
<i>Patients Compensation Fund v. Lutheran Hospital-LaCrosse</i>	<i>State v. Burns</i>	<i>Deutsches Land, Inc. v. City of Glendale</i>	<i>Peace v. Northwestern Nat'l Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Smith v. Katz</i>	<i>Burks v. St. Joseph's Hosp.</i>	<i>Dawn Alt v. Cline</i>	<i>State v. Williams</i>
<i>State v. Delgado</i>	<i>Community Credit Plan, Inc. v. Johnson</i>	<i>Kierstyn v. Racine Unified Sch. Dist.</i>	<i>State v. Agnello</i>
<i>State v. Velez</i>	<i>State v. Zarnke</i>	<i>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	<i>Milwaukee Teachers' Educ. Ass'n v. Milwaukee Bd. of Sch. Dirs.</i>
<i>Juneau County v. Courthouse Empls., Local 1312</i>	<i>State v. Kiernan</i>	<i>State v. Kivioja</i>	<i>State v. Spears</i>
<i>State v. O'Brien</i>	<i>Eberle v. Dane County Bd. of Adjustment</i>	<i>State v. Jones (In re Return of Prop.)</i>	<i>State v. Scheidell</i>
<i>State v. Gray</i>	<i>Sawyer v. Midelfort (5-1)</i>	<i>General Cas. Co. v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	<i>Kett v. Community Credit Plan, Inc.</i>
<i>Beard v. Lee Enterprises, Inc.</i>		<i>Jandrt v. Jerome Foods, Inc.</i>	
<i>Snopek v. Lakeland Med. Ctr.</i>		<i>Elections Bd. v. Wisconsin Mfrs. & Commerce (4-2)</i>	
<i>Schreiber v. Physicians Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Antwaun A. v. Heritage Mut. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Bodoh</i>			
<i>State v. Broomfield</i>			
<i>County of Kenosha v. C & S Mgmt.</i>			
<i>Hull v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Prosser v. Leuck</i>			
<i>Paige K.B. and Kaitlin I.B. v. Steven G.B.</i>			
<i>State v. Armstrong</i>			
<i>State v. Mendoza</i>			
<i>King v. King</i>			
<i>American Family Mut. Ins. Co. v. Department of Revenue</i>			
<i>Johnson v. Blackburn</i>			
<i>State v. Dundon</i>			
<i>State v. Brandt</i>			
<i>Holman v. Family Health Plan</i>			
<i>Peters v. Menard, Inc.</i>			

(continued on following page)

¹ In two cases there were justices who concurred in part and dissented in part. For this table, and those prepared for other years, each such vote has been 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 of Justices Prosser and Wilcox in *Deutsches Land, Inc. v. City of Glendale* have been classified as dissents, while the vote of Justice Prosser in *Elections Bd. v. Wisconsin Mfrs. & Commerce* has been classified as a concurrence.

<i>Reyes v. Greatway Ins. Co.</i>
<i>Ide v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>City of Sun Prairie v. Davis</i>
<i>State v. Eesley</i>
<i>Drow v. Schwarz</i>
<i>Schwab v. Timmons</i>
<i>Brown v. Dibbell</i>
<i>State v. Love</i>
<i>State v. Secrist</i>
<i>State v. Krueger</i>
<i>State v. Faucher</i>
<i>State DOT v. Peterson</i>
<i>Wisconsin Elec. Power Co. v. Labor & Indus. Review Comm'n</i>
<i>State v. Horn</i>
<i>State v. Smythe (In re Smythe)</i>
<i>McDonough v. Department of Workforce Dev.</i>
<i>State ex rel. Hager v. Marten</i>
<i>State v. Erickson</i>
<i>Meyer v. School Dist.</i>
<i>Mann v. Bankruptcy Estate of Badger Lines, Inc. (In re Badger Lines)</i>
<i>State v. Reitter</i>
<i>Jose DeJesus Fuentes v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District IV</i>
<i>Arneson v. Jezwinski (6-0)</i>
<i>Sharp v. Case Corp.</i>
<i>Ness v. Digital Dial Communs., Inc. (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Curiel (In re Curiel) (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Kienitz (In re Kienitz) (6- 0)</i>
<i>Wausau Tile, Inc. v. County Concrete Corp. (6-0)</i>
<i>State v. Sprosty (In re Sprosty) (6- 0)</i>
<i>Riccitelli v. Broekhuizen (6-0)</i>