

TWENTY



EAGLE

A blog about the New York Court of Appeals

New York Court of Appeals 2023 – 2024 Term Statistics

We compiled the following statistics based on information available from the Court. Same basic disclosures as before: we don't track attorney-discipline cases, we group decisions into three categories, and we characterize modifications as either reversals or affirmances depending on the circumstances. Let us know if you have any questions. Enjoy!

Total Decisions

Total Decisions			
	Civil	Criminal	Total
Signed Opinions	38	42	80
Memorandum Opinions	8	7	15
SSM decisions	3	6	9
Total	49	55	104
Total 2022 - 2023	48	28	76
Total 2021 - 2022	47	44	91
Total 2020 - 2021	35	31	66

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. We list two appeals from County Courts (*Bay, Lovett*) as from the AT, though they're not technically from the Term.

	Total Cases		Affirmed		Reversed	
AD1	41	42.3%	21	51.2%	17	41.5%
AD2	18	18.6%	8	44.4%	10	55.6%
AD3	20	20.6%	10	50.0%	8	40.0%
AD4	14	14.4%	7	50.0%	7	50.0%
AT	6	4.1%	2	25.0%	4	75.0%

Total Judge Counts							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Total Individual Writings	21	34	12	15	23	17	18
Total Dissents	5	19	3	3	11	5	3
Total Concurrences	6	3	1	1	0	2	1
Authored the Majority Opinion	10	12	8	11	12	10	14
Rate	13%	15%	10%	14%	15%	13%	18%
Majority Op. - Joined	52	44	54	53	53	57	45
Rate	65%	55%	68%	66%	66%	71%	56%
- Concurred	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
- Concurred in Result	4	2	1	2	1	1	2
Rate	5%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%
- Dissented	12	19	12	10	11	8	6
Rate	15%	24%	15%	13%	14%	10%	8%
- Dissented in Part	0	1	3	3	3	0	0
Rate	0%	1%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%
Mem. Decision - Joined	14	10	15	15	15	13	15
Rate	93%	67%	100%	100%	100%	87%	100%
- Concurred	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Rate	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
- Dissented	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
Rate	7%	27%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
SSM Decision - Joined	7	6	9	9	9	9	9
Rate	78%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
- Concurred	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
- Dissented	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Rate	11%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%



Total Decisions - Vote Count

Decisions by Vote Count					
	7 to 0	6 to 1	5 to 2	4 to 3	Total
Signed Opinions	41	9	8	22	80
<i>Civil</i>	25	2	2	9	38
<i>Criminal</i>	16	7	6	13	42
Memorandum Opinions	11	3	0	1	15
<i>Civil</i>	6	1	0	1	8
<i>Criminal</i>	5	2	0	0	7
SSM Decisions	6	1	2	0	9
<i>Civil</i>	2	0	1	0	3
<i>Criminal</i>	4	1	1	0	6
Total	58	13	10	23	104
Total Civil Cases	33	3	3	10	49
Total Criminal Cases	25	10	7	13	55

Rate of vote count				
	7 to 0	6 to 1	5 to 2	4 to 3
Signed Opinions	51%	11%	10%	28%
<i>Civil</i>	66%	5%	5%	24%
<i>Criminal</i>	38%	17%	14%	31%
Memorandum Opinions	73%	20%	0%	7%
<i>Civil</i>	75%	13%	0%	13%
<i>Criminal</i>	71%	29%	0%	0%
SSM Decisions	67%	11%	22%	0%
<i>Civil</i>	67%	0%	33%	0%
<i>Criminal</i>	67%	17%	17%	0%
Total	56%	13%	10%	22%
Total Civil Cases	67%	6%	6%	20%
Total Criminal Cases	45%	18%	13%	24%

Total	7 to 0	6 to 1	5 to 2	4 to 3
2023 - 2024	56%	13%	10%	22%
2022 - 2023	66%	14%	18%	1%
2021 - 2022	51%	15%	22%	12%
Civil				
2023 - 2024	67%	6%	6%	20%
2022 - 2023	60%	19%	19%	2%
2021 - 2022	43%	23%	21%	13%
Criminal				
2023 - 2024	45%	18%	13%	24%
2022 - 2023	75%	7%	18%	0%
2021 - 2022	59%	7%	23%	11%

These tables report data about unanimity. Fun fact: there were no cases decided by less than seven judges this year—meaning, we don't need to report which sub-seven-judge decisions we're reporting in which category. There's also a new table comparing unanimity rates across years.



Frequency in the Majority

Frequency in the Majority							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannata	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	68	59	63	66	66	68	61
<i>Civil</i>	33	32	32	34	33	32	29
<i>Criminal</i>	35	27	31	32	33	36	32
Memorandum Opinions	14	11	15	15	15	14	15
<i>Civil</i>	7	6	8	8	8	7	8
<i>Criminal</i>	7	5	7	7	7	7	7
SSM Decisions	7	6	9	9	9	9	9
<i>Civil</i>	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Criminal</i>	5	4	6	6	6	6	6
Total	89	76	87	90	90	91	85
Total Civil Cases	42	40	43	45	44	42	40
Total Criminal Cases	47	36	44	45	46	49	45

Rate in the Majority							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannata	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	85%	74%	79%	83%	83%	85%	76%
<i>Civil</i>	87%	84%	84%	89%	87%	84%	76%
<i>Criminal</i>	83%	64%	74%	76%	79%	86%	76%
Memorandum Opinions	93%	73%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%
<i>Civil</i>	88%	75%	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%
<i>Criminal</i>	100%	71%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
SSM Decisions	78%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Civil</i>	67%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Criminal</i>	83%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	86%	73%	84%	87%	87%	88%	82%
Total Civil Cases	86%	82%	88%	92%	90%	86%	82%
Total Criminal Cases	85%	65%	80%	82%	84%	89%	82%

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	12	20	15	13	14	8	6
<i>Civil</i>	4	5	5	4	5	5	3
<i>Criminal</i>	8	15	10	9	9	3	3
Memorandum Opinions	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Civil</i>	1	2	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Criminal</i>	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
SSM Decisions	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Civil</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Criminal</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	26	15	13	14	9	6
Total Civil Cases	6	8	5	4	5	6	3
Total Criminal Cases	8	18	10	9	9	3	3

Rate in Dissent							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Signed Opinions	15%	25%	19%	16%	18%	10%	8%
<i>Civil</i>	11%	13%	13%	11%	13%	13%	8%
<i>Criminal</i>	19%	36%	24%	21%	21%	7%	7%
Memorandum Opinions	7%	27%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
<i>Civil</i>	13%	25%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%
<i>Criminal</i>	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SSM Decisions	11%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Civil</i>	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Criminal</i>	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	13%	25%	14%	13%	13%	9%	6%
Total Civil Cases	12%	16%	10%	8%	10%	12%	6%
Total Criminal Cases	15%	33%	18%	16%	16%	5%	5%



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%	87%	66%	69%	68%	84%	92%
Rivera	87%	100%	58%	58%	58%	77%	77%
Garcia	66%	58%	100%	99%	96%	76%	75%
Singas	69%	58%	99%	100%	97%	76%	77%
Cannataro	68%	58%	96%	97%	100%	72%	76%
Troutman	84%	77%	76%	76%	72%	100%	89%
Halligan	92%	77%	75%	77%	76%	89%	100%

Same Vote in Signed Majority Opinion Cases (Civil)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	92%	75%	78%	76%	89%	90%
Rivera	92%	100%	78%	76%	73%	89%	81%
Garcia	75%	78%	100%	97%	95%	78%	81%
Singas	78%	76%	97%	100%	97%	76%	84%
Cannataro	76%	73%	95%	97%	100%	73%	81%
Troutman	89%	89%	78%	76%	73%	100%	94%
Halligan	90%	81%	81%	84%	81%	94%	100%

Same Vote in Signed Majority Opinion Cases (Criminal)							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	83%	59%	61%	62%	79%	94%
Rivera	83%	100%	40%	43%	44%	67%	74%
Garcia	59%	40%	100%	100%	98%	74%	69%
Singas	61%	43%	100%	100%	98%	76%	71%
Cannataro	62%	44%	98%	98%	100%	72%	71%
Troutman	79%	67%	74%	76%	72%	100%	85%
Halligan	94%	74%	69%	71%	71%	85%	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%	81%	67%	69%	69%	83%	94%
Rivera	81%	100%	47%	49%	50%	67%	72%
Garcia	67%	47%	100%	100%	98%	80%	77%
Singas	69%	49%	100%	100%	98%	82%	79%
Cannataro	69%	50%	98%	98%	100%	79%	79%
Troutman	83%	67%	80%	82%	79%	100%	89%
Halligan	94%	72%	77%	79%	79%	89%	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.



Judge Correlation

(In Closely Divided Cases)

Same Vote in Closely Divided Cases							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	90%	12%	16%	18%	53%	69%
Rivera	90%	100%	10%	7%	10%	59%	56%
Garcia	12%	10%	100%	97%	94%	37%	35%
Singas	16%	7%	97%	100%	97%	34%	40%
Cannataro	18%	10%	94%	97%	100%	30%	42%
Troutman	53%	59%	37%	34%	30%	100%	67%
Halligan	69%	56%	35%	40%	42%	67%	100%

Same Vote in Closely Divided Civil Cases							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	83%	15%	23%	23%	58%	50%
Rivera	83%	100%	25%	17%	17%	64%	30%
Garcia	15%	25%	100%	92%	92%	25%	40%
Singas	23%	17%	92%	100%	100%	17%	50%
Cannataro	23%	17%	92%	100%	100%	17%	50%
Troutman	58%	64%	25%	17%	17%	100%	67%
Halligan	50%	30%	40%	50%	50%	67%	100%

Same Vote in Closely Divided Criminal Cases							
	Wilson	Rivera	Garcia	Singas	Cannataro	Troutman	Halligan
Wilson	100%	95%	10%	11%	15%	50%	81%
Rivera	95%	100%	0%	0%	5%	56%	73%
Garcia	10%	0%	100%	100%	95%	44%	31%
Singas	11%	0%	100%	100%	95%	47%	33%
Cannataro	15%	5%	95%	95%	100%	39%	38%
Troutman	50%	56%	44%	47%	39%	100%	67%
Halligan	81%	73%	31%	33%	38%	67%	100%

These tables show judge correlation in closely divided cases—that is, cases decided by a vote of either 4 - 3 or 5 - 2. They show how frequently a judge in the left column voted the same way as a judge in the top row—that is, where they each voted with the majority by joining a majority opinion or concurrence, or by each having dissented from a majority opinion.

