

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

<b>7-0 (or 6-0)</b>	<b>6-1 (or 5-1)</b>	<b>5-2</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>57/84 (68%)</b>	<b>11/84 (13%)</b>	<b>10/84 (12%)</b>	<b>6/84 (7%)</b>
<i>Gerhardt v. Estate of Moore</i>	<i>State ex rel. Smith v. Oak Creek</i>	<i>State v. Penigar</i>	<i>Felder v. Casey</i>
<i>County of Milwaukee v. Labor &amp; Industry Review Comm'n</i>	<i>Bush v. National School Studios, Inc.</i>	<i>State v. Guzy</i>	<i>Jacobs v. Major</i>
<i>Ziegler Co. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i>	<i>Kujawski v. Arbor View Health Care Center</i>	<i>State v. Sarlund</i>	<i>State v. Nelson</i>
<i>Finding of Contempt in State v. Dewerth</i>	<i>State v. Grant</i>	<i>Darcel, Inc. v. Manitowoc Bd. of Review</i>	<i>State ex rel. McCoy v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. 1</i>
<i>State v. Horn</i>	<i>Marshall-Wisconsin Co. v. Juneau Square Corp.</i>	<i>In re Custody of D.M.M.</i>	<i>State v. Friedrich</i>
<i>State v. Evers</i>	<i>State v. Muentner</i>	<i>State v. Labor &amp; Industry Review Com.</i>	<i>Bell v. County of Milwaukee</i>
<i>Bachowski v. Salamone</i>	<i>Nicholson v. Home Ins. Cos.</i>	<i>State v. Clappes</i>	
<i>State v. Harvey</i>	<i>State v. Turner</i>	<i>State ex rel. Unnamed Petitioners v. Connors</i>	
<i>Schwochert v. American Family Mut. Ins. Co.</i>	<i>School Dist. v. Northwest United Educators</i>	<i>State v. Perry</i>	
<i>Richardson v. Richardson</i>	<i>State v. Hanson</i>	<i>State v. Washington</i>	
<i>Perpignani v. Vonasek</i>	<i>State ex rel. Swan v. Elections Bd. (5-1, per curiam)</i>		
<i>La Crosse Police &amp; Fire Comm'n v. Labor &amp; Indus. Review Comm'n</i>			
<i>State v. Trudeau</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Department of Dev. v. State Bldg. Com.</i>			
<i>Hartford Ins. Co. v. Wales</i>			
<i>Kraemer Bros., Inc. v. Pulaski State Bank</i>			
<i>State v. Anderson</i>			
<i>J.A. v. Skow</i>			
<i>In re S. B.</i>			
<i>State v. Frase</i>			
<i>Mutual Service Casualty Co. v. American Family Ins. Group</i>			
<i>Blue Cross &amp; Blue Shield United v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>Lawlis v. Thompson</i>			
<i>In re Proposed Guardianship &amp; Protective Placement of K.S.</i>			
<i>Watts v. Watts</i>			
<i>Gonzalez v. Franklin</i>			
<i>In re Paternity of D.L.T.</i>			
<i>In re Finding of Contempt Relative to Attorney's Fees</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.

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, 1986-1987

<i>State v. Zielke</i>			
<i>State v. Pham</i>			
<i>Robinson v. Mt. Sinai Medical Center</i>			
<i>Green Spring Farms v. Kersten</i>			
<i>Liberty Homes, Inc. v. Department of Industry, Labor &amp; Human Relations</i>			
<i>Chappy v. Labor &amp; Industry Review Com.</i>			
<i>State v. Malone</i>			
<i>Warmka v. Hartland Cicero Mut. Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Nerison</i>			
<i>Wilmot v. Racine County</i>			
<i>Empire General Life Ins. Co. v. Silverman</i>			
<i>Washington County v. Luedtke</i>			
<i>Lambert v. Wrensch</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Newspapers, Inc. v. Showers</i>			
<i>Treiber v. Knoll</i>			
<i>Wood v. Milin</i>			
<i>State v. Syed Tagi Shah</i>			
<i>State v. Carrington</i>			
<i>State v. Stoehr</i>			
<i>State v. Wickstrom</i>			
<i>Bushko v. Miller Brewing Co.</i>			
<i>Jackson County Iron Co. v. Musolf</i>			
<i>Rural Mut. Ins. Co. v. Peterson</i>			
<i>Brooks v. Hayes</i>			
<i>State v. Crandall</i>			
<i>State v. Johnson</i>			
<i>In re Petition to Review State Bar Bylaw Amendments (per curiam)</i>			
<i>LaRocque v. LaRocque (6-0)</i>			
<i>Dowd v. New Richmond (6-0)</i>			