



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

November 29, 2018

To:

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

Carlo Esqueda
Clerk of Circuit Court
215 S. Hamilton St., Rm. 1000
Madison, WI 53703

David M. Flores
Unit 108
7165 Belle Fontaine Blvd.
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:

2017AP1760 Valerie Lynn Kreger v. David M. Flores (LC # 2009FA1232)

Before Lundsten, P.J, Blanchard and Kloppenburg, 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, pro se, appeals a circuit court order denying her motion to modify custody and placement in this paternity action involving Kreger's child with David Flores. Kreger argues that the court erred in concluding that Kreger failed to show a substantial change in circumstances. Based upon our review of the brief¹ and record, we conclude at conference

¹ David Flores, the respondent, did not file a brief.

that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2015-16).² We reject Kreger’s arguments and affirm.

We need not recount the lengthy procedural history of this case. The sole focus of this appeal is Kreger’s motion to modify the circuit court’s custody and placement order. As grounds for her motion, Kreger alleged that school attendance records showed that the child had repeatedly been absent or tardy while in Flores’s care. Kreger also alleged that the child reported that Flores yelled frequently. The circuit court held a hearing and allowed Kreger to present documentary evidence and witness testimony. At the conclusion of the hearing, the court denied Kreger’s motion, explaining that Kreger’s showing was “so far from enough of a substantial change in circumstances, and not enough to overcome the presumption of maintaining the status quo.”

Kreger’s brief does not develop any argument that the circuit court erred in denying her motion. In particular, Kreger fails to point us to any record facts from which we could evaluate her arguments. Instead, Kreger makes rambling arguments that bear little relation to the specific grounds Kreger identified in her motion. “We decline to embark on our own search of the record, unguided by references and citations to specific testimony, to look for ... evidence to support the argument.” *Mogged v. Mogged*, 2000 WI App 39, ¶19, 233 Wis. 2d 90, 607 N.W.2d 662 (1999) (quoted source omitted). We therefore reject Kreger’s arguments as undeveloped. *See State ex rel. Myers v. Smith*, 2009 WI App 49, ¶17, 316 Wis. 2d 722, 766 N.W.2d 764 (we need not consider inadequately briefed arguments, even from pro se litigants).

² All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version unless otherwise noted.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

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

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

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Court of Appeals