



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**

September 8, 2016

To:

Hon. Shelley J. Gaylord  
Circuit Court Judge  
215 South Hamilton, Br 6, Rm 5105  
Madison, WI 53703

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

David M. Flores  
6504 Pheasant Lane, Apt. 108  
Middleton, WI 53562

Valerie Lynn Kreger  
P. O. Box 628582  
Middleton, WI 53562

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

---

2015AP2346

Valerie Lynn Kreger v. David M. Flores (L.C. # 2009FA1232)

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

Valerie Kreger, pro se, appeals an order vacating an order for waiver of fees and costs earlier entered and denying Kreger's petition for waiver of fees and costs. After reviewing Kreger's brief<sup>1</sup> and the record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2013-14).<sup>2</sup> For the reasons discussed below, we summarily affirm.

Kreger sought a waiver of transcript fees and appellate filing fees pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 814.29(1)(a). The petition she filed did not include her signature or notarization as standard

---

<sup>1</sup> David Flores, the respondent, did not file a brief.

<sup>2</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2013-14 version unless otherwise noted.

circuit court form CV-410 (Petition for Waiver of Fees and Costs—Affidavit of Indigency and Order) requires. Rather than presenting her petition to the judge assigned to her ongoing family case as required by Dane County Circuit Court Rule 102(6), Kreger presented the petition to a duty judge, who denied it. Kreger then took her petition for fee waiver to a second duty judge, who signed the order for fee waiver, even though the petition was not properly signed and notarized and was not submitted to the proper judge. Because Kreger’s petition was not properly completed and because the second duty judge had mistakenly overlooked the rule, the assigned circuit court vacated the order granting the waiver of transcript and appellate filing fees. The assigned court noted that Kreger, who had previously sought fee waivers from it as well as other duty judges under similar circumstances in the past, had evidently “judge shopped” until she found a duty judge willing to mistakenly sign the order for waiver of fees and costs currently before us.

In taking up the issue of Kreger’s petition for waiver of fees and costs anew, the assigned circuit court concluded that Kreger was indigent. However, the court also concluded that the issues Kreger sought to appeal, having to do with moving her and Flores’s child out of state and reopening the paternity judgment for DNA testing, were meritless, and outlined the reasons for that conclusion.

Kreger’s argument on appeal consists of critical allegations against the assigned judge and a series of quotations from WIS. STAT. § 814.29. Kreger offers no analysis of the governing statutory provisions or legal standards, and no explanation of her conclusory statement that the circuit court improperly exercised its discretion. Further, Kreger ignores that the circuit court found her indigent, and completely fails to address the court’s conclusion that the issues Kreger seeks to appeal are not arguably meritorious, which is an additional required consideration in the

fee waiver process. *See State ex rel. Girouard v. Circuit Court for Jackson Cty.*, 155 Wis. 2d 148, 159, 454 N.W.2d 792 (1990).

Kreger's argument is wholly undeveloped. We do not develop parties' issues and arguments for them on appeal, even when they are pro se. *See State ex rel. Harris v. Smith*, 220 Wis. 2d 158, 164-65, 582 N.W.2d 131 (Ct. App. 1998); *see also State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 647, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992). Because Kreger's brief does not meet minimal standards of legal analysis, we decline to consider Kreger's appeal further. *See M.C.I., Inc. v. Elbin*, 146 Wis. 2d 239, 244-45, 430 N.W.2d 366 (Ct. App. 1988) (This court may decline to consider arguments that are unexplained, undeveloped, or unsupported by citation to legal authority.).

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the order vacating the order for waiver of fees and costs and denying the petition for waiver of fees and costs is summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

---

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