New York Court of Appeals 2022 – 2023 Term Statistics

We compiled the following statistics based on information available from the Court. Explanations accompany each set of statistics, but three notes about our methodology are in order. First, we don't track decisions in attorney discipline cases and we break down the Court's other decisions into three categories: signed opinions, memorandum opinions, and summary track decisions. We categorize per curiam decisions in the memorandum opinion category. Second, we treat a decision as unanimous if all the judges that voted reached the same result, even if there were concurring opinions. Third, we look to the substance of the Court's decision to determine if a modification constitutes an affirmance or a reversal. If you have any questions or suggestions, please let us know!

Total Decisions

Total Decisions

	Civil	Criminal	Total
Signed Opinions	38	15	53
Memorandum Opinions	7	6	13
SSM decisions	3	7	10
Total	48	28	76
Total 2021-2022	47	44	91
Total 2020-2021	35	31	66
Total 2019-2020	47	39	86

The table above shows the total number of decisions issued by the Court in each category.

For the table to the right: the top shows the number of individual writings by each judge in each category; the bottom shows the number of times each judge did the thing identified.

The table below shows where the Court's cases came from and how frequently those courts were affirmed or reversed.

	Total Cases		Affirmed		Reversed	
AD1	19	25.3%	4	21.1%	15	78.9%
AD2	20	26.7%	9	45.0%	11	55.0%
AD3	20	26.7%	11	55.0%	9	45.0%
AD4	13	17.3%	5	38.5%	7	53.8%
AT1/2	3	4.0%	0	0.0%	3	100%

Total Judge Counts

	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Total Individual Writings	21	23	16	10	10	10	3
Total Dissents	9	12	2	4	0	2	1
Total Concurrences	3	2	3	1	0	1	0
Authored the Majority Opinion	9	9	11	5	10	7	2
Rate	17%	17%	9%	9%	19%	13%	4%
Majority Op. - Joined	33	31	36	41	40	43	4
Rate	62%	58%	68%	77%	75%	81%	8%
- Concurred	1	0	1	2	1	0	0
Rate	2%	0%	2%	4%	2%	0%	0%
- Concurred in Result	1	2	1	1	0	0	0
Rate	2%	4%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%
- Dissented	7	6	4	4	1	2	1
Rate	13%	11%	8%	8%	2%	4%	2%
- Dissented in Part	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mem. Decision - Joined	7	9	12	12	12	11	1
Rate	54%	69%	92%	92%	92%	85%	8%
- Concurred	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
Rate	15%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	0%
- Dissented	4	3	0	0	0	1	0
Rate	31%	23%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%
SSM Decision - Joined	8	7	10	10	10	8	3
Rate	80%	70%	100%	100%	100%	80%	30%
- Concurred	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
- Dissented	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	20%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Total Decisions - Vote Count

Decisions by Vote Count					
	6 to 0	5 to 1	4 to 2	*4-3	Total
Signed Opinions	35	8	9	1	53
Civil	23	7	7	1	38
Criminal	12	1	2	0	15
Memorandum Opinions	8	2	3	0	13
Civil	4	1	2	0	7
Criminal	4	1	1	0	6
SSM Decisions	7	1	2	0	10
Civil	2	1	0	0	3
Criminal	5	0	2	0	7
Total	50	11	14	1	76
Total Civil Cases	29	9	9	1	48
Total Criminal Cases	21	2	5	0	28

Rate of vote count				
	6 to 0	5 to 1	4 to 2	*4-3
Signed Opinions	66%	15%	17%	2%
Civil	61%	18%	18%	3%
Criminal	80%	7%	13%	0%
Memorandum Opinions	62%	15%	23%	0%
Civil	57%	14%	29%	0%
Criminal	67%	17%	17%	0%
SSM Decisions	70%	10%	20%	0%
Civil	67%	33%	0%	0%
Criminal	71%	0%	29%	0%
Total	66%	14%	18%	1%
Total Civil Cases	60%	19%	19%	2%
Total Criminal Cases	75%	7%	18%	0%

These tables report data about unanimity. Because the Court operated for substantially all of the 2022-2023 Term with six judges, we have reported the data to reflect six-judge splits. The 6-0 category includes seven 7-0 decisions (*People v. Wheeler*; *Matter of Borelli v. Clarkstown*; *People v. Muhammad*; *Matter of Teamsters v. Monroe*; *Matter of Drivers v. NYS DOT*; *People v. Worley*; *People ex rel. E.S. v. Superintendent*); Judge Halligan was the seventh vote in each case. The 4-2 category includes two 5-2 decisions (*Moore Charitable Foundation v. PJT Partners*; *People v. Anthony*); Judge Nancy Smith (AD4) was the seventh vote in *Moore Charitable Foundation*; Judge Halligan was the seventh vote in *Anthony*. The Court issued one 4-3 decision (*People ex rel. Rivera v. Superintendent*); Judge Halligan was the seventh vote.

Frequency in the Majority

Frequency in the Majority							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	44	42	49	49	51	50	6
Civil	31	28	35	35	36	36	3
Criminal	13	14	14	14	15	14	3
Memorandum Opinions	9	10	13	13	13	12	1
Civil	5	5	7	7	7	6	1
Criminal	4	5	6	6	6	6	0
SSM Decisions	8	7	10	10	10	8	3
Civil	3	2	3	3	3	2	0
Criminal	5	5	7	7	7	6	3
Total	61	59	72	72	74	70	10
Total Civil Cases	39	35	45	45	46	44	4
Total Criminal Cases	22	24	27	27	28	26	6

Rate in the Majority							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	83%	79%	92%	92%	96%	94%	11%
Civil	82%	74%	92%	92%	95%	95%	8%
Criminal	87%	93%	93%	93%	100%	93%	20%
Memorandum Opinions	69%	77%	100%	100%	100%	92%	8%
Civil	71%	71%	100%	100%	100%	86%	14%
Criminal	67%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
SSM Decisions	80%	70%	100%	100%	100%	80%	30%
Civil	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	67%	0%
Criminal	71%	71%	100%	100%	100%	86%	43%
Total	80%	78%	95%	95%	97%	92%	13%
Total Civil Cases	81%	73%	94%	94%	96%	92%	8%
Total Criminal Cases	79%	86%	96%	96%	100%	93%	21%

A judge is treated as having been in the majority if the judge voted with the majority, regardless of whether the judge wrote or joined a separate concurring opinion.

Frequency in Dissent

Frequency in Dissent							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	9	8	4	4	1	2	1
Civil	7	7	3	3	1	2	1
Criminal	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Memorandum Opinions	4	3	0	0	0	1	0
Civil	2	2	0	0	0	1	0
Criminal	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
SSM Decisions	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Civil	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Criminal	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	14	4	4	1	3	1
Total Civil Cases	9	10	3	3	1	3	1
Total Criminal Cases	6	4	1	1	0	0	0

Rate in Dissent							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	17%	15%	8%	8%	2%	4%	2%
Civil	18%	18%	8%	8%	3%	5%	3%
Criminal	13%	7%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Memorandum Opinions	31%	23%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%
Civil	29%	29%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%
Criminal	33%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SSM Decisions	20%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Civil	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Criminal	29%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	20%	18%	5%	5%	1%	4%	1%
Total Civil Cases	19%	21%	6%	6%	2%	6%	2%
Total Criminal Cases	21%	14%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%

Judge Correlation

(In Cases Resolved by a Signed Opinion)

Same Vote in Signed Majority Opinion Cases (All)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	84%	75%	75%	81%	88%	86%
Rivera	84%	100%	76%	76%	84%	80%	100%
Garcia	75%	76%	100%	96%	94%	88%	86%
Singas	75%	76%	96%	100%	90%	88%	86%
Cannataro	81%	84%	94%	90%	100%	94%	86%
Troutman	88%	80%	88%	88%	94%	100%	83%
Halligan	86%	100%	86%	86%	86%	83%	100%

Same Vote in Signed Majority Opinion Cases (Civil)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	80%	74%	74%	78%	87%	100%
Rivera	80%	100%	71%	71%	79%	74%	100%
Garcia	74%	71%	100%	95%	95%	87%	75%
Singas	74%	71%	95%	100%	89%	87%	75%
Cannataro	78%	79%	95%	89%	100%	92%	75%
Troutman	87%	74%	87%	87%	92%	100%	75%
Halligan	100%	100%	75%	75%	75%	75%	100%

Same Vote in Signed Majority Opinion Cases (Criminal)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	93%	80%	80%	87%	93%	67%
Rivera	93%	100%	87%	87%	93%	93%	100%
Garcia	80%	87%	100%	100%	93%	93%	100%
Singas	80%	87%	100%	100%	93%	93%	100%
Cannataro	87%	93%	93%	93%	100%	100%	100%
Troutman	93%	93%	93%	93%	100%	100%	100%
Halligan	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

For cases resolved by a signed majority opinion, these tables show how frequently a judge in the left column voted the same way—i.e., voted with the majority by joining a majority opinion or through a concurrence, or dissented from a majority opinion—as a judge in the top row, in cases where both judges cast a vote.

Judge Correlation

(In All Cases)

Same Vote in All Cases							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	84%	75%	75%	79%	84%	73%
Rivera	84%	100%	75%	75%	81%	80%	82%
Garcia	75%	75%	100%	97%	96%	90%	91%
Singas	75%	75%	97%	100%	93%	90%	91%
Cannataro	79%	81%	96%	93%	100%	94%	91%
Troutman	84%	80%	90%	90%	94%	100%	89%
Halligan	73%	82%	91%	91%	91%	89%	100%

Same Vote in All Cases (Civil)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	78%	75%	75%	79%	83%	100%
Rivera	78%	100%	71%	71%	77%	75%	100%
Garcia	75%	71%	100%	96%	96%	87%	80%
Singas	75%	71%	96%	100%	91%	87%	80%
Cannataro	79%	77%	96%	91%	100%	91%	80%
Troutman	83%	75%	87%	87%	91%	100%	80%
Halligan	100%	100%	80%	80%	80%	80%	100%

Same Vote in All Cases (Criminal)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	93%	75%	75%	79%	85%	50%
Rivera	93%	100%	82%	82%	86%	88%	67%
Garcia	75%	82%	100%	100%	96%	96%	100%
Singas	75%	82%	100%	100%	96%	96%	100%
Cannataro	79%	86%	96%	96%	100%	100%	100%
Troutman	85%	88%	96%	96%	100%	100%	100%
Halligan	50%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

For all cases, these tables show how frequently a judge in the left column voted the same way—i.e., voted with the majority by joining a majority opinion or through a concurrence, or dissented from a majority opinion—as a judge in the top row, in cases where both judges cast a vote.

TWENTY
EAGLE

A blog about the
New York Court of Appeals