



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 I

September 27, 2022

To:

Hon. Thomas J. McAdams
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Demetrik Brown
4668 North 39th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53209

George Christenson
Clerk of Circuit Court
Milwaukee County Appeals Division
Electronic Notice

Godella Petty
3902 Milwaukee St.
Madison, WI 53707

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

2021AP580

Demetrik Brown v. Godella Petty (L.C. # 2017FA1347)

Before Donald, P.J., Dugan and White, 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).

Godella Petty, *pro se*, appeals the circuit court's order denying her motion for reconsideration. She raises various arguments pertaining to a judgment of divorce entered by the circuit court. We conclude at conference that this appeal is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2019-20).¹ Upon review, we affirm.

The circuit court entered a judgment divorcing Petty from Demetrik Brown on April 25, 2018. Petty did not appear at the divorce hearing. On August 27, 2019, Petty moved the circuit

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2019-20 version unless otherwise noted.

court to reconsider the divorce judgment. On May 4, 2020, the circuit court held a hearing on the motion and denied it. Petty then filed the current appeal. Brown, who is proceeding *pro se* on appeal, did not file a respondent's brief, so the appeal was submitted to this court for decision based on Petty's appellant's brief and the circuit court record.

Petty's arguments do not address the circuit court's decision denying her motion for reconsideration and are not adequately developed. Her arguments are supported by nothing more than general statements that lack any legal analysis or reasoning. We will not address her arguments because they are not adequately developed. See *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 647, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (we may decline to review issues that are inadequately briefed). In addition, Petty cites no legal authority in support of her claims. It is well established that "[a]rguments unsupported by references to legal authority will not be considered." *Id.* at 646. As we explained in *Pettit*, we are a "fast-paced, high-volume court" and, as such, "[t]here are limits beyond which we cannot go in overlooking these kinds of failings." *Id.* at 647. Petty's appellant's brief "is so lacking in organization and substance that for us to decide [the] issues, we would first have to develop them. We cannot serve as both advocate and judge." *Id.* Therefore, we summarily affirm the circuit court's order denying Petty's motion for reconsideration.

Upon the foregoing,

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