

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND FILED**

January 25, 2005

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. 04-0631
STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Cir. Ct. No. 03CV008330

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT I**

**IN RE CITY OF MILWAUKEE V. LIST OF
TAX LIENS FOR 2003 #2:**

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,

PETITIONER-RESPONDENT,

v.

JEROME THORNTON,

RESPONDENT-APPELLANT.

APPEAL from a judgment of the circuit court for Milwaukee County: DENNIS P. MORONEY, Judge. *Affirmed.*

Before Wedemeyer, P.J., Fine and Curley, JJ.

¶1 FINE, J. Jerome Thornton appeals *pro se* from a judgment of foreclosure. In September of 2003, the City of Milwaukee filed a petition for judgment to foreclose a tax lien on Thornton's property. See WIS.

STAT. § 75.521(3)4. (commencement of proceeding to foreclose tax lien by petition for judgment). The trial court held a hearing on January 12, 2004. Thornton appeared *pro se*, and claimed that he had paid his taxes. He could not, however, show that he had followed the statutory requirements for filing an answer to the State's petition. *See* § 75.521(7) (right to answer petition). The trial court adjourned the hearing for two weeks, and ordered Thornton to bring the required proof. When the hearing resumed, Thornton was still unable to show that he had filed an answer pursuant to the statute, or that he had paid his taxes as he claimed. The trial court thus granted the City a judgment of foreclosure, and vested title to Thornton's property in the City.

¶2 Although Thornton purports to appeal from the judgment of foreclosure, he has not submitted a proper brief on appeal. His brief consists of various documents from the foreclosure proceedings; he makes no attempt to explain why the trial court erred. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(e) (appellant's brief must have "[a]n argument ... contain[ing] the contention of the appellant, the reasons therefore, with citations to the authorities, statutes and parts of the record relied on"). While Thornton is *pro se*, even *pro se* litigants must give reasons for their appeal. Even under the most liberal view of rights of *pro se* litigants, Thornton's brief is insufficient. *See Waushara County v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16, 20 (1992) (*pro se* litigants "bound by the same rules that apply to attorneys on appeal"); *Holz v. Busy Bees Contracting, Inc.*, 223 Wis. 2d 598, 608–609, 589 N.W.2d 633, 637 (Ct. App. 1998) (at a minimum, *pro se* appellant must show factual or legal basis for undoing trial court's findings). Accordingly, we affirm.

By the Court.—Judgment affirmed.

Publication in the official reports is not recommended.

