



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 III**

February 10, 2015

To:

Hon. Kristina M. Bourget  
Circuit Court Judge  
721 Oxford Avenue  
Eau Claire, WI 54703

Ryan A. Clough

Susan Schaffer  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Eau Claire County Courthouse  
721 Oxford Avenue, Ste. 2220  
Eau Claire, WI 54703-5496

Suzanne M. Poirier

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

---

2014AP169

Ryan A. Clough v. Suzanne M. Poirier (L. C. #2013CV553)

Before Hoover, P.J., Stark and Hruz, JJ.

Suzanne Poirier, pro se, appeals a harassment injunction ordering her to have no contact with a former boyfriend. Based upon our review of the brief and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition and we summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2011-12).

Poirier's brief is largely unintelligible. Her apparent attempt to write in an elevated writing style renders many statements nonsensical, and she fails to develop any legal arguments. She appears to argue the court erroneously considered hearsay evidence, but she does not cite the record to demonstrate she preserved any such claims, much less develop a coherent argument. *See State v. Flynn*, 190 Wis. 2d 31, 39 n.2, 527 N.W.2d 343 (Ct. App. 1994) ("We will not decide issues that are not, or inadequately, briefed.").

Poirier also appears to take issue with the circuit court’s findings of fact, asserting various evidence was untruthful. We do not resolve factual disputes. Rather, we defer to the trial court on credibility determinations because of its “superior opportunity ... to observe the demeanor of witnesses and to gauge the persuasiveness of their testimony.” *Johnson v. Merta*, 95 Wis. 2d 141, 151-52, 289 N.W.2d 813 (1980) (source omitted).

We further observe that Poirier misrepresents the record. She asserts the circuit court somehow erred by hearing testimony that she sent 400 text messages in one day, because doing so would be impossible. The transcript, however, reveals that Poirier’s former boyfriend in fact testified she had texted him 400 times over the course of nearly two months. Further, the court never indicated it believed 400 messages were sent in one day.

As a whole, Poirier’s brief is so deficient that it does not merit review.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed.

---

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