



OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS**

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215  
P.O. BOX 1688  
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Telephone (608) 266-1880  
TTY: (800) 947-3529  
Facsimile (608) 267-0640  
Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT IV**

March 20, 2014

*To:*

Hon. Juan B. Colas  
Circuit Court Judge  
215 South Hamilton, Br.10, Rm. 7103  
Madison, WI 53703

Bratislav Stankovic  
Veljko Vlahovic 18/19  
1000 Skopje,  
Republic of Macedonia

Carlo Esqueda  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Room 1000  
215 South Hamilton  
Madison, WI 53703

Mark J. Steichen  
Boardman & Clark, LLP  
P.O. Box 927  
Madison, WI 53701-0927

Marta T. Meyers  
Boardman & Clark, LLP  
1 S. Pinckney St., 4th Fl.  
P.O. Box 927  
Madison, WI 53701-0927

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following opinion and order:

---

2013AP1756

In re the marriage of: Ana Garic-Stankovic v. Bratislav Stankovic  
(L.C. # 2009FA405)

Before Blanchard, P.J., Lundsten and Sherman, JJ.

Bratislav Stankovic appeals from a postdivorce order that denied his “motion requesting explanation of judge’s misappropriation of respondent’s \$18,000.” Respondent Ana Garic moves for a protective order limiting Stankovic’s ability to file future motions or appeals in the family action. After reviewing the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is

appropriate for summary disposition under Wis. STAT. RULE 809.21(1) (2011-12).<sup>1</sup> We affirm the circuit court's order but deny the motion for a protective order.

According to the affidavit and exhibits filed in support of Stankovic's circuit court motion, the \$18,000 to which Stankovic refers was a check he was ordered to draft in February of 2010 to deposit in a client trust fund, which was later distributed in increments to Stankovic's ex-wife, Garic, as part of a child support offset to the property division.

Garic points out that this court affirmed the judgment of divorce—necessarily including both the property division and child support awards—in *Garic-Stankovic v. Stankovic*, No. 2011AP2262, unpublished op. and order (WI App April 8, 2013). Stankovic does not dispute Garic's assertion that Stankovic has previously raised before this court all of the issues he is now asserting on this appeal relating to the property division. Under the law of the case doctrine, “a decision on a legal issue by an appellate court establishes the law of the case, which must be followed in all subsequent proceedings in the trial court or on later appeal.” *State v. Stuart*, 2003 WI 73, ¶23, 262 Wis. 2d 620, 664 N.W.2d 82 (quoted source omitted). We therefore conclude that Stankovic is procedurally barred from again challenging the property division on appeal.

As to the requested protective order, Garic has not addressed the criteria for restricting a litigant's access to court as set forth in *Village of Tigerton v. Minniecheske*, 211 Wis. 2d 777, 785-86, 565 N.W.2d 586 (Ct. App. 1997) and *Minniecheske v. Griesbach*, 161 Wis. 2d 743, 748-49, 468 N.W.2d 760 (Ct. App. 1991). Nor has she provided citations to any authority that

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2011-12 version unless otherwise noted.

would authorize this court to restrict filing in any court other than our own. We therefore decline to grant the requested relief at this time, although we do not preclude the future possibility of such an order if Stankovic continues his pattern of repetitive litigation.

IT IS ORDERED that the postdivorce order denying Stankovic's "motion requesting explanation" is summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

---

*Diane M. Fremgen*  
*Clerk of Court of Appeals*