



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 II**

February 14, 2018

To:

Hon. Patrick C. Haughney  
Circuit Court Judge  
Waukesha County Courthouse  
515 W. Moreland Blvd.  
Waukesha, WI 53188

Robert M. Snow  
Chief Deputy Clerk  
Waukesha County Courthouse  
515 W. Moreland Blvd.  
Waukesha, WI 53188

Terry E. Johnson  
Peterson, Johnson & Murray, S.C.  
788 N. Jefferson St., Ste. 500  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3763

Alfred Boeckeler  
Patricia Boeckeler  
4556 N. 103rd St.  
Milwaukee, WI 53226

Nichole Chaffee  
6199 Sycamore St.  
Greendale, WI 53129

Jackson Correctional Institution  
Business Office  
P.O. Box 232  
Black River Falls, WI 54615-0232

Christine Reuter  
890 Taft Terrace  
Hartford, WI 53027

Ronald Schroeder  
Waukesha County Jail  
P.O. Box 0217  
Waukesha, WI 53187

Special Litigation & Appeals Unit  
Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53707-7857

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

---

2016AP2466

Ronald Schroeder v. Nichole Chaffee (L.C. #2010CV1373)

Before Neubauer, C.J., Reilly, P.J., and Hagedorn, J.

**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).**

Ronald Schroeder appeals pro se from an order denying his request for permission to file claims against his ex-wife, Nichole Chaffee, in their family law case, Milwaukee County Circuit

Court case No. 2006FA7189. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. § 809.21 (2015-16).<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

In 2010, Schroeder filed a defamation lawsuit against several defendants, including Chaffee, accusing them of submitting false and defamatory letters to the sentencing court in his criminal case.<sup>2</sup> By order entered September 27, 2010, the circuit court found that the lawsuit was frivolous and “made for the purpose of harassing or punishing the Defendants,” and permanently enjoined Schroeder “from filing any suit, complaint, or claim against any of the named Defendants, either individually or collectively, without advance permission from the judge assigned to the civil case.”<sup>3</sup>

Pursuant to the September 27, 2010 order, Schroeder sought permission from the circuit court assigned to this case to file an action in the Milwaukee County family case seeking to enforce a July 1, 2009 family court order as to Chaffee. Specifically, Schroeder asserted that the family court order required Chaffee to provide him each year with their children’s school pictures, one piece of artwork, and their report cards. Schroeder alleged that Chaffee had failed

---

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

<sup>2</sup> In *State v. Schroeder*, Waukesha County case No. 2007CF496, Schroeder was convicted of twenty-nine felonies and two misdemeanors for sexually assaulting and photographing an unconscious female in his home. Before sentencing, the defendants, who had no direct connection to the case but knew Schroeder from past relationships, submitted letters to the court chronicling prior instances of Schroeder’s abuse.

<sup>3</sup> At a subsequent hearing the circuit court further determined that the lawsuit violated a court order in Schroeder’s criminal case prohibiting the filing of malicious or harassing lawsuits. We affirmed the circuit court’s determinations that Schroeder’s lawsuit was frivolous and in violation of the order prohibiting the filing of malicious or harassing lawsuits. *Ronald Schroeder v. Nichole Chaffee*, No. 2011AP601, unpublished op. and order (WI App Aug. 1, 2012).

to comply with the order and offered to provide the court a copy of the order. Schroeder told the court:

I write my daughters weekly (I have my entire period of incarceration) and I prefer my letters to be about them, not me. I've enjoyed complimenting them on their academics and I miss being able to do that. And I imagine they miss the letters centered around them and their various school classes.

By order of September 12, 2016, the circuit court entered an order granting Schroeder “permission to file an appropriate motion in Milwaukee County case No. 2006-FA-7189 seeking enforcement of the July 1, 2009 order.” The order specified: “This permission is limited to filing a petition and/or motion that is the subject matter of the April 7, 2016 letter.”

Thereafter, Schroeder submitted a second letter thanking the circuit court for its order and asking for additional permission to petition the Milwaukee family court to:

(1) Modify placement and child support; (2) compel Ms. Chaffee to disclose our shared daughters’ medical and school information ... ; (3) compel Ms. Chaffee to add our daughters to the prison’s visiting list so I may sent them Christmas gifts; and (4) join our daughters’ school officials to that case so I may obtain the school records from them[.]

By order entered October 25, 2016, the circuit court denied Schroeder “permission to file a petition seeking any items specified” in his second letter. The court recounted that the underlying lawsuit was found to be “malicious or harassing” and that though Schroeder denied the suit was brought to harass, the circuit court’s findings to the contrary were upheld on appeal. Given this history along with Schroeder’s incarcerated status, the circuit court determined that Schroeder’s motion to modify placement “amounts to an act of harassment” that the injunction was meant to prohibit. Schroeder appeals.

Schroeder argues that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion in denying his request for permission to bring the claims against Chaffee proposed in his second letter.<sup>4</sup> We agree with Schroeder that the circuit court's decision was discretionary in nature. We will not reverse a discretionary determination if the record shows that discretion was in fact exercised and we perceive a reasonable basis for the court's decision. *Miller v. Hanover Ins. Co.*, 2010 WI 75, ¶30, 326 Wis. 2d 640, 785 N.W.2d 493. We generally look for reasons to sustain a discretionary determination. *Id.*

Schroeder has not shown an erroneous exercise of discretion. The circuit court had just granted Schroeder's request to file an enforcement action to obtain his children's school pictures and report cards so he could write more meaningful letters. In what could reasonably be construed as an attempt to push the envelope, Schroeder submitted a second letter lacking the detail and reasoning in his first letter and seeking to bring additional substantial claims. Given the fact of Schroeder's prison incarceration, the circuit court determined that a motion to modify placement was baseless and would only serve to harass Chaffee. We find no fault with this reasoning, especially in light of Schroeder's prior harassment of Chaffee in the underlying frivolous lawsuit, the lack of information in Schroeder's letter about the existing order concerning placement and facts relevant to the legal standard for a modification motion, and given the patently baseless nature of other of Schroeder's proposed claims, particularly his

---

<sup>4</sup> Schroeder also argues that the circuit court violated his due process rights by rendering its decision without affording the *defendants* an opportunity to be heard. Schroeder's argument seems to be that by denying his request without requiring the defendants' response, the circuit court acted as an advocate. We will not further address Schroeder's due process claim because it is undeveloped and unsupported by citation to relevant legal authority. See *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 647, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992). The case law Schroeder cites is not remotely applicable to the facts of his case.

request to join officials from the children's school as parties to the postjudgment divorce action. Similarly, the circuit court could reasonably determine that allowing Schroeder to drag Chaffee into court to litigate his remaining baseless claims, such as that Chaffee be required to add the children to his prison visitors list, would serve no legitimate purpose and would harass Chaffee.<sup>5</sup>

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

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

---

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

---

<sup>5</sup> To the extent we have not addressed an argument raised by Schroeder on appeal, the argument is deemed rejected. See *State v. Waste Mgmt. of Wis., Inc.*, 81 Wis. 2d 555, 564, 261 N.W.2d 147 (1978).