



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

DIRECTOR OF STATE COURTS
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Jill J. Karofsky
Chief Justice

16 East State Capitol
Telephone 608-266-6828
Fax 608-267-0980

Hon. Audrey K. Skwierawski
Director of State Courts

Wisconsin Supreme Court accepts three cases at recent conference

Madison, Wisconsin (July 6, 2026) - The Wisconsin Supreme Court recently voted to accept three cases, and the Court acted to deny review in a number of other cases at its June 15, 2026 conference. The case numbers, counties of origin and the issues presented in granted cases are listed below. More information about pending appellate cases can be found on the Wisconsin Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Access [website](#). Published Court of Appeals opinions can be found [here](#), and the status of pending Supreme Court cases can be found [here](#).

No. 2024AP117

[Santner v. Matson](#)

Supreme Court case type: Petition for Review

Court of Appeals: District II

Circuit Court: Waukesha County, Judge Michael P. Maxwell, *affirmed* [Lazar. J., dissenting].

Long caption: In re the estate of Scott M. Santner: Mark Santner, Appellant-Respondent, v. Anthony Matson, Earl Jacobson, Debbie Klineschmidt and Kerwyn Splude, Respondents-Petitioners.

Issue(s) presented:

1. Whether delivery of an unwitnessed will to an individual's intended donee constitutes delivery to establish a gift causa mortis.

No. 2024AP1013

[Abby Windows, LLC v. Labor & Industry Review Commission](#)

Supreme Court case type: Petition for Review

Court of Appeals: District II

Circuit Court: Waukesha County, Judge Michael J. Aprahamian, *affirmed*.

Long caption: Abby Windows, LLC, Petitioner-Respondent- Respondent, v. Labor & Industry Review Commission, Respondent-Appellant-Petitioner, Wis. Dept of Workforce Development UI Division, Respondent-Co-Appellant-Petitioner, Daniel R. Tarpey, Respondent.

Issue(s) presented:

1. Should this Court revisit and modify the framework for statutory interpretation set out in State ex. Kalal v. Circuit Court, 2004 WI 58, 271 Wis. 2d 633, 681 N.W.2d 110, under which the determination of whether a statutory term has a plain meaning or is ambiguous is limited to dictionary definitions and “intrinsic” sources, in favor of a broader, holistic approach that gives due consideration “to relevant extrinsic sources to interpret a statute’s meaning, conscious . . . of these sources’ limitations?”
 2. Alternatively, did the Court of Appeals err in treating the statutory “public policy declaration” in WIS. STAT. § 108.01 as merely a rule of construction, rather than a textual statement of scope and purpose that under Kalal must be considered to determine the plain meaning of WIS. STAT. § 108.2(15)(k)(16). in the first instance, with the result that the Court of Appeals incorrectly concluded that the statutory term “consumer products” was unambiguous?
 3. Whether the court of appeals erred in applying the statutory interpretation framework established by this court in Kalal by not giving due consideration to an applicable intrinsic source, the Unemployment Act’s purpose statement under WIS. STAT. § 108.01(1) and the plain meaning of the law?
 4. Whether the court of appeals erred in its analysis of WIS. STAT. § 108.02(15)(k)16. by finding the statutory phrase “consumer products” unambiguous, and by doing so, did it err by resorting to multiple dictionary definitions to separately define each word and by disregarding relevant extrinsic sources?
-

No. 2024AP1175

Minority Business Association of Wisconsin v. Wisconsin
Dept. of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection

Supreme Court case type: Petition for Review

Court of Appeals: District III

Circuit Court: Waukesha County, Judge Michael J. Aprahamian, *affirmed*.

Long caption: Minority Business Association of Wisconsin and Divine Landscaping LLC, Plaintiffs-Appellants-Petitioners, v. Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection, Defendant-Respondent-Respondent.

Issue(s) presented:

1. Under the Wisconsin and U.S. Constitutions, an administrative-search regime is constitutional only if it affords the target of the search an opportunity to obtain meaningful precompliance review of the search demand before a neutral decisionmaker. Has a party subject to administrative searches under such a regime set forth a justiciable claim under the Uniform Declaratory Judgment Act when, before it receives a search demand, it claims that the regime is unconstitutional precisely because it fails to provide meaningful precompliance review?
-

Review denied: The Supreme Court denied review in the following cases. As the state’s law-developing court, the Supreme Court exercises its discretion to select for review only those cases that fit certain [statutory criteria](#) (see Wis. Stat. § 809.62). Except where indicated, these cases came to the Court via petition for review by the party who lost in the lower court:

Brown County

2025AP1954-CRLV State v. Butler
2025AP1978-CRLV

Calumet County

2023AP1304-CR State v. Flemming

Columbia County

2024AP2-CR State v. O’Grady

Dane County

2025AP2280-W Koeckeritz v. Wisconsin Ethics Commission
[Supervisory Writ]

2023AP847-CRNM State v. Halderson

2023AP1945-CR State v. Natcone
[Justice S.M. Crawford did not participate]

2024AP72-CR State v. Gadson
[Chief Justice J. J. Karofsky did not participate]

2024AP491-CR State v. Lenti

2024AP990-CR State v. Shanklin

Dunn County

2023AP2266-CR

State v. McCandless

2024AP134-CR

State v. Cocherell

Fond du Lac County

2025AP200-CR

State v. Martinez

2025AP2727-FT

Fond du Lac County v. S.R.H.

Grant County

2025AP500

Grant County v. T.L.M.

Green County

2024AP888-CR

State v. Lewis

Jackson County

2025AP2143-W

Thums v. Buesgen

Juneau County

2023AP1666

Johnson v. Hinchley

2025AP971-W

Perez v. Circuit Court for Juneau County

Kenosha County

2023AP1216-CR

State v. Reyes Mendez

2023AP2128-CR

State v. Bloom

2023AP2267-CR State v. Turner

2024AP2426-CR State v. White

Milwaukee County

2022AP2228-CR State v. Kenyon

2023AP1060-CR State v. Cage
[Justice J.C. Protasiewicz did not participate]

2023AP1271-CR State v. Doss

2023AP1987 State v. Hubbard
2023AP1988

2023AP2223-CR State v. Gilbert

2024AP1450-CR State v. Pierce
[Justice J.C. Protasiewicz did not participate]

2023AP1454 State v. Lanaghan

2024AP438 State v. Smith

2024AP559-CR State v. Hayslett

2024AP1410-CR State v. Lewis

2025AP159 G.N. v. G.D.N.
2025AP160

2025AP161 G.N. v. G.D.N.
2025AP162

2025AP1338
2025AP1339 State v. V.T.
2025AP1340

2025AP1476 State v. B.A.J.
2025AP1477

2025AP2523-W Lee v. Court of Appeals, Dist. I
[Supervisory Writ]

2025AP2581-W

Oliver v. Circuit Court for Milwaukee County
[Supervisory Writ]

Monroe County

2025AP387-CR

State v. T.R.T.

Outagamie County

2023AP663-CR

State v. Krause

2024AP545-CR

State v. McKenzie

Pierce County

2024AP282

Leisz v. Leisz

Portage County

2024AP1517-CR

State v. Thomas

Racine County

2023AP2293

Cullen v. Franecki

2024AP6-CR

State v. Buckley

2024AP1208

State v. Lewis

2024AP2162-CR

State v. Jordan

2025AP152-CRNM

State v. Howell

2025AP2122-W

Davis v. Circuit Court for Racine County
[Supervisory Writ]

Rock County

2023AP2372-CR

State v. Collazo

2024AP1431-CR

State v. Weathers

Sheboygan County

2022AP1619

Schilling v. Agnesian Healthcare Fond du Lac Regional Clinic Main

2023AP272-CR

State v. Mares

St. Croix County

2023AP1037-CR

State v. Cameron

Vilas County

2024AP18-CR

State v. Karas

Walworth County

2023AP1575-CR

State v. Wanless

2024AP1588-CR

State v. Mellen

Washington County

2024AP742

Doubleday v. C. Goeman Properties V LLC
[Justice A.K. Ziegler did not participate]

2024AP2013

State v. Lodwick

2025AP578

Mehler v. Moden

Waukesha County

2024AP676

Orzech v. Wisconsin Veterinary Referral Center – Waukesha

2024AP1501

Cannon & Dunphy, S.C. v. The William M. Cannon Trust
[Justice A.K. Ziegler did not participate]

Wood County

2024AP1632

State v. Mathews

CONTACT:
Stephen Kelley
Public Information Officer
communications@wicourts.gov
(608) 261-6640