



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

DISTRICT IV

July 12, 2017

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 S. Hamilton, Rm. 1000
Madison, WI 53703

David M. Flores
6709 Century Ave., #105
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:

2016AP472	Valerie Lynn Kreger v. David M. Flores (L.C. # 2009FA1232)
2016AP660	Valerie Lynn Kreger v. David M. Flores (L.C. # 2009FA1232)

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

Summary disposition orders may not be cited in any court of this state as precedent or authority, except for the limited purposes specified in WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(3).

Valerie Kreger appeals three post-adjudication orders entered in related paternity cases involving her child with David Flores. The first order, dated February 1, 2016, was based on a bench ruling that limited Kreger to submitting only one filing per week, no longer than five pages. The second order, dated April 25, 2016, granted Flores's motion to reduce his child support based upon a substantial change in circumstances, expunged some child support arrearages, and provided direction as to who could claim the child as a dependent. In addition, the second order denied Kreger's cross-motion to impute additional income to Flores. The third

order, dated May 6, 2016, denied Kreger's motion for a change of venue. After reviewing the record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2015-16).¹ We affirm for the reasons discussed below.

Kreger's brief raises several complaints about the fairness of the challenged orders. The brief fails, however, to develop any coherent arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record, and instead relies largely upon conclusory assertions and irrelevant statutes to demand relief. A party must do more than "simply toss a bunch of concepts into the air with the hope that either the ... court or the opposing party will arrange them into viable and fact-supported legal theories." *State v. Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d 328, 337, 600 N.W.2d 39 (Ct. App. 1999). Consequently, this court need not consider or address arguments that are unsupported by adequate factual and legal citations or are otherwise undeveloped. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(d) and (e) (setting forth the requirements for an appellant's brief); *Grothe v. Valley Coatings, Inc.*, 2000 WI App 240, ¶6, 239 Wis. 2d 406, 620 N.W.2d 463 (regarding lack of cites to record); *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (regarding undeveloped arguments). We therefore reject the appellant's claims based upon the deficiencies in the brief.

IT IS ORDERED that the circuit court's orders are summarily affirmed under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version unless otherwise noted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Court of Appeals