

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

<b>7-0 (or 6-0)</b>	<b>6-1 (or 5-1)</b>	<b>5-2 (or 4-2)</b>	<b>4-3 (or 3-2)</b>
<b>7/40 (18%)</b>	<b>2/40 (5%)</b>	<b>24/40 (60%)</b>	<b>7/40 (18%)</b>
<i>State v. Eric L. Loomis</i>	<i>Fontana Builders, Inc. v. Assurance Company of America</i>	<i>Aman Singh v. Paul Kemper<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>State v. Matalonis</i>
<i>David M. Marks v. Houston Casualty Company</i>	<i>Hoffer Properties v. State of Wisconsin, Department of Transportation (5-1)</i>	<i>City of Eau Claire v. Melissa M. Booth</i>	<i>Patti J. Roberts v. T.H.E. Insurance Company</i>
<i>State v. Richard J. Sulla</i>		<i>State v. Timothy L. Finley, Jr.</i>	<i>Albert D. Moustakis v. State of Wisconsin Department of Justice</i>
<i>State v. Patrick K. Tourville</i>		<i>Sonja Blake v. Debra Jossart</i>	<i>Peggy Z. Coyne v. Scott Walker</i>
<i>State v. Leopoldo R. Salas Gayton (6-0)</i>		<i>Dennis D. Dufour v. Progressive Classic Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State DOJ v. State Dept. of Workforce Dev. (3-2)</i>
<i>S. A. M. v. Nancy M. Meister (6-0)</i>		<i>State v. Mastella L. Jackson</i>	<i>Wisconsin Pharmacal Company, LLC v. Nebraska Cultures of California, Inc. (3-2)</i>
<i>State v. Iverson (6-0)</i>		<i>Water Well Solutions Service Group Inc. v. Consolidated Insurance Company</i>	<i>Kenneth C. Burgraff, Sr. v. Menard, Inc. (3-2)</i>
		<i>Prince Corporation v. James N. Vandenberg</i>	
		<i>John Doe 56 v. Mayo Clinic Health System - Eau Claire Clinic, Inc.</i>	
		<i>Milwaukee Police Association v. City of Milwaukee</i>	
		<i>State v. Luis C. Salinas</i>	
		<i>Cheryl M. Sorenson v. Richard A. Batchelder</i>	
		<i>St. Croix County Department of Health and Human Services v. Michael D</i>	
		<i>Walworth State Bank v. Abbey Springs Condominium Association, Inc.</i>	
		<i>State v. Lagrone</i>	
		<i>State v. Andy J. Parisi</i>	
		<i>Lands' End, Inc. v. City of Dodgeville (4-2)</i>	
		<i>State v. Rory A. McKellips (4-2)</i>	
		<i>State v. Stephen LeMere (4-2)</i>	

(continued on following page)

<sup>1</sup> Due to rounding, the percentages do not add up to 100. Occasionally a decision finds a justice concurring in part and dissenting 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.

<sup>2</sup> *Singh v. Kemper* was a fractured decision, and views may differ regarding the appropriate column in which to place it.

	<i>State v. Jimmie Lee Smith</i> (4-2)
	<i>United Food &amp; Commercial Workers Union v. Hormel Foods Corporation</i> (4-2)
	<i>State v. Valadez</i> (4-2)
	<i>State v. Brett W. Dumstrey</i> (4-2)
	<i>Winnebago County v. Christopher S.</i> (4-2)