

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

<b>7-0 (or 6-0)</b>	<b>6-1</b>	<b>5-2</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>54/67 (81%)</b>	<b>4/67 (6%)</b>	<b>3/67 (4%)</b>	<b>6/67 (9%)</b>
<i>In re Paternity of A.M.C.</i>	<i>State v. McDonald</i>	<i>Brookfield v. Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Dist.</i>	<i>State ex rel. Wisconsin Senate v. Thompson</i>
<i>State v. Mitchell</i>	<i>State ex rel. Jeske v. Jeske</i>	<i>Pamperin v. Trinity Memorial Hospital</i>	<i>Wagner v. Continental Casualty Co.</i>
<i>Vretenar v. Hebron</i>	<i>Blackhawk Production Credit Asso. v. Chicago Title Ins. Co.</i>	<i>State v. Anderson</i>	<i>Milwaukee v. K.F.</i>
<i>State v. Koch</i>	<i>State ex rel. Jones v. Gerhardstein</i>		<i>Tucker v. Marcus</i>
<i>Estate of Logan v. Northwestern Nat'l Casualty Co.</i>			<i>State v. Tompkins</i>
<i>In re Paternity of M.J.B.</i>			<i>State v. Hartman</i>
<i>Glamann v. St. Paul Fire &amp; Marine Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Davis</i>			
<i>Madison v. Madison Professional Police Officers Asso.</i>			
<i>Burger v. Burger</i>			
<i>Racine Steel Castings v. Hardy</i>			
<i>Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc. v. Department of Natural Resources</i>			
<i>Herrell v. Herrell</i>			
<i>In re Estate of Ristau</i>			
<i>State v. Schumacher</i>			
<i>Kohnke v. St. Paul Fire &amp; Marine Ins. Co.</i>			
<i>State v. Cunningham</i>			
<i>Schuster v. Altenberg</i>			
<i>State v. Moretto</i>			
<i>Steinbarth v. Johannes</i>			
<i>K.L. v. Hinickle</i>			
<i>State v. Boettcher</i>			
<i>State v. Sugden</i>			
<i>C.L. v. Olson</i>			
<i>Ripley v. Brown</i>			
<i>State v. Knight</i>			
<i>State v. Crowley</i>			
<i>Stuart v. Stuart</i>			
<i>State v. McCoy</i>			
<i>State v. Sorenson</i>			
<i>State v. Stewart</i>			
<i>Henning v. General Motors Assembly Div.</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>In re K.C.</i>			
<i>Appleton v. Menasha</i>			
<i>Kensington Dev. Corp. v. Israel</i>			
<i>Kenosha v. Phillips</i>			
<i>Kerkman v. Hintz</i>			
<i>Poindexter v. Poindexter</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Teunas v. County of Kenosha</i>			
<i>State v. Koput</i>			
<i>Consumer's Co-op v. Olsen</i>			
<i>Griffin v. Reeve</i>			
<i>In re D.S.</i>			
<i>State v. Baudhuin</i>			
<i>Guertin v. Harbour Assurance Co.</i>			
<i>Alexander v. Riegert</i>			
<i>M &amp; I Marshall &amp; Ilsley Bank v. Somers</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Carkel, Inc. v. Circuit Court for Lincoln County</i>			
<i>State ex rel. Stevens v. Circuit Court for Manitowoc County</i>			
<i>State v. Gomaz</i>			
<i>Daniel v. Bank of Hayward (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Thomas (6-0)</i>			
<i>Bohms v. Bohms (6-0)</i>			
<i>State v. Brecht (6-0)</i>			