

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND RELEASED**

November 9, 1995

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

NOTICE

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

No. 94-2585

STATE OF WISCONSIN

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT IV**

RENEE E. SALINAS,

Petitioner-Respondent,

v.

MICKELLETTTE CHICINI,

Respondent-Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Rock County:
PATRICK J. RUDE, Judge. *Reversed.*

Before Dykman, Sundby, and Vergeront, JJ.

PER CURIAM. Mickellette Chicini appeals from an injunction order entered by the trial court. For the reasons set forth below, we reverse.

BACKGROUND

Renee E. Salinas is a registered nurse. Chicini and Salinas lived together for several months. After they broke up, Salinas moved for an injunction. At the hearing, evidence presented by Salinas and her neighbor established that Chicini had called several of Salinas's employers alleging that she stole drugs from work and used them illegally. Chicini also came to Salinas's house and squealed his car tires as he drove around the house late at night. The trial court granted the petition and entered a harassment injunction effective until September 15, 1996. Chicini appeals.

ANALYSIS

By order dated January 5, 1995, we informed Salinas that her brief was delinquent. We granted her an additional five days to file, with good cause shown for delay. However, Salinas did not respond, and by order dated January 31, 1995, we indicated that we would decide the matter based solely on Chicini's brief.

In the absence of Salinas's brief, we have no argument on troubling issues, such as whether the trial court erred in granting an order without finding that the requirements of § 813.125(4)(a), STATS., were satisfied, whether the original petition alleged harassment as defined in § 947.013, STATS., whether there were reasonable grounds to believe Chicini violated § 947.013, whether the injunction was overbroad, and whether the evidence was sufficient to support the injunction. Under RULE 809.83(2), STATS., failure to file a brief is grounds for reversal. We conclude that we should do so in this case.

By the Court. — Order reversed.

This opinion will not be published. See RULE 809.23(1)(b)5, STATS.