

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

<b>7-0 (or 6-0, 5-0)</b>	<b>6-1 (or 5-1)</b>	<b>5-2</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>66/83 (80%)</b>	<b>2/83 (2%)</b>	<b>9/83 (11%)</b>	<b>6/83 (7%)</b>
<i>Shannon v. Shannon</i>	<i>Richards v. Young</i>	<i>Gerhardt v. Estate of Moore</i>	<i>International Asso. of Machinists &amp; Aerospace Workers, IAM Local 437 v. United States Can Co.</i>
<i>In Interest of G.H.</i>	<i>State v. Johnson (5-1)</i>	<i>State v. Migliorino</i>	<i>Oak Creek v. King</i>
<i>State v. Thomas</i>		<i>Felder v. Casey</i>	<i>Kukor v. Grover</i>
<i>Lindas v. Cady</i>		<i>State v. Wilson</i>	<i>State v. American TV &amp; Appliance, Inc.</i>
<i>State v. Unnamed Defendant</i>		<i>Milwaukee v. Nelson</i>	<i>State v. Jones</i>
<i>Agnew v. American Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>		<i>State v. Smith</i>	<i>State v. Romero</i>
<i>Sheely v. Department of Health &amp; Social Services</i>		<i>Kaun v. Industrial Fire &amp; Casualty Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>Clearfield v. Cushman</i>		<i>Wood v. American Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	
<i>State v. Jose Martinez</i>		<i>Rice v. Oshkosh</i>	
<i>State v. John Martinez</i>			
<i>Franz v. Brennan</i>			
<i>White v. Leeder</i>			
<i>State v. Harris</i>			
<i>Smith v. Milwaukee County</i>			
<i>Zinda v. Louisiana Pacific Corp.</i>			
<i>State v. Crowell</i>			
<i>State v. Dwyer</i>			
<i>Klinger v. Oneida County</i>			
<i>Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc. v. Department of Natural Resources</i>			
<i>Pulsfus Poultry Farms, Inc. v. Leeds</i>			
<i>State v. Kramar</i>			
<i>State v. Hanson</i>			
<i>West Bend Co. v. Labor &amp; Industry Review Com.</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Stedman v. Rohner</i>			
<i>State v. Oberlander</i>			
<i>Dziewa v. Vossler</i>			
<i>Esser Distributing Co. v. Steidl</i>			
<i>Arena v. Lincoln Lutheran of Racine, Inc.</i>			
<i>State v. Sher</i>			
<i>Meracle v. Children's Service Soc.</i>			
<i>State v. Gove</i>			
<i>State v. Owens</i>			

(continued on following page)

<sup>1</sup> In few instances, a justice authored a separate opinion that concurred in part and dissented in part. For this and other tables, 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.

<i>Wright v. Coleman</i>			
<i>Sunnyslope Grading, Inc. v. Miller, Bradford &amp; Risberg, Inc.</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Parrish v. Circuit Court for Kenosha County</i>			
<i>State v. Resio</i>			
<i>Imark Indus. v. Arthur Young &amp; Co.</i>			
<i>Tenpas v. Department of Natural Resources</i>			
<i>State v. Montgomery</i>			
<i>Spitler v. Dean</i>			
<i>State v. Dziuba</i>			
<i>Anchor Sav. &amp; Loan Asso. v. Coyle</i>			
<i>Funk v. Wollin Silo &amp; Equipment, Inc.</i>			
<i>In re Marriage of Krebs</i>			
<i>Univest Corp. v. General Split Corp.</i>			
<i>Schultz v. Production Stamping Corp.</i>			
<i>State v. Franklin</i>			
<i>Minuteman, Inc. v. Alexander</i>			
<i>State v. Jackson</i>			
<i>Local Union No. 487, IAFF-CIO v. Eau Claire</i>			
<i>State v. Friday</i>			
<i>Douglas v. Dewey</i>			
<i>State v. Moffett</i>			
<i>John E. Gregory &amp; Son, Inc. v. A. Guenther &amp; Sons Co.</i>			
<i>Ziegler Co. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i>			
<i>State v. Jensen</i>			
<i>American Federation of State, etc. Local 1901 v. Brown County</i>			
<i>Martin v. Milwaukee Mut. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Big John</i>			
<i>State v. Kazee</i>			
<i>State v. Lomax</i>			
<i>State v. Robinson</i>			
<i>Mausing v. Mausing</i>			
<i>Fox v. Bock (6-0)</i>			
<i>Staples v. Young (6-0)</i>			
<i>McAleavy v. McAleavy (5-0)</i>			