

**COURT OF APPEALS  
DECISION  
DATED AND FILED**

**May 30, 2002**

Cornelia G. Clark  
Clerk of Court of Appeals

**NOTICE**

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See WIS. STAT. § 808.10 and RULE 809.62.

**Appeal No. 01-2556-CR  
STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Cir. Ct. No. 00-CM-1911

**IN COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT IV**

---

**STATE OF WISCONSIN,**

**PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,**

**v.**

**MICHAEL MACKESSY,**

**DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.**

---

APPEAL from a judgment of the circuit court for Dane County:  
MORIA KRUEGER, Judge. *Affirmed.*

¶1 ROGGENSACK, J.<sup>1</sup> Michael Mackessy appeals his conviction for disorderly conduct, contrary to WIS. STAT. § 947.01, attempted battery to a law

---

<sup>1</sup> This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(f) (1999-2000). Additionally, all further references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 1999-2000 version unless otherwise noted.

enforcement officer, contrary to WIS. STAT. § 939.32 and § 940.20(2) and resisting a law enforcement officer, contrary to WIS. STAT. § 946.41(1). His convictions arose out of an interaction with police officers that occurred at his apartment on May 16, 2000.

¶2 Mackessy's brief identifies no legal issues, as is required by WIS. STAT. § 809.19(1)(b), and it cites no statutory or common law in support of his appeal, as is required by § 809.19(1)(e). Instead, he provides a narration of what he contends occurred during the incident that led to his arrest. His narration contains no citations to the record, contrary to his obligation under § 809.19(1)(e), even though this matter reaches us after a jury trial that resulted in the convictions set forth above.

¶3 While we try to be understanding of those who appear before us *pro se*, as Mackessy is, *pro se* litigants are not excused from the rules of appellate procedure. We cannot handle the extensive workload which this court is expected to service when an appellant does not fulfill his duties under these rules. *See Cascade Mountain, Inc. v. Capitol Indem. Corp.*, 212 Wis. 2d 265, 270 & n.3, 569 N.W.2d 45, 47 & n.3 (Ct. App. 1997). Therefore, we do not consider arguments for which no legal authority has been cited, *State v. Shaffer*, 96 Wis. 2d 531, 545-46, 292 N.W.2d 370, 378 (Ct. App. 1980), and for which the factual portion of the argument is not supported with citations to the record. *Lechner v. Scharrer*, 145 Wis. 2d 667, 676, 429 N.W.2d 491, 495 (Ct. App. 1988). Because Mackessy's brief does not even attempt to comply with the requirements of WIS. STAT. § 809.19, we affirm the judgment of the circuit court without further discussion.

*By the Court.*—Judgment affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(1)(b)4.

