



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 I**

April 25, 2023

To:

Hon. Timothy M. Witkowiak  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Stephanie M. Przytarski  
7701 West Verona Court  
Milwaukee, WI 53219

Anna Hodges  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Milwaukee County Appeals Division  
Electronic Notice

Laura R. Schwefel  
N73 W22494 Hamilton Crt.  
Sussex, WI 53089

Gary Kramschuster  
8240 West Coventry Drive  
Franklin, WI 53132

Ted B. Vallejos  
645 Cornell Street  
Perth Amboy, NJ 08861

Sandra Kramschuster  
8240 West Coventry Drive  
Franklin, WI 53132

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

---

2022AP1012

Stephanie M. Przytarski v. Ted B. Vallejos (L.C. # 2022FA829)

Before Brash, C.J., Donald, P.J., and Dugan, 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).**

Stephanie M. Przytarski appeals an order of the circuit court denying her motion to vacate numerous orders entered throughout the course of her fifteen-year litigation. Upon review, we affirm the circuit court.

This case has been before this court more times than it can count. What began as a paternity action filed in 2007 has continued with Przytarski filing numerous motions and appeals. The latest appeal pertains to an order of the circuit court denying Przytarski's motion to vacate numerous orders entered over the course of fifteen years, as well as a judgment of paternity dating back to 2007. Przytarski argues that: (1) the circuit court denied the motion to vacate as untimely; (2) the circuit court conspired with the defendant, Ted B. Vallejos, to abandon their child; (3) the circuit court acted as counsel for Vallejos at the hearing underlying this appeal; and (4) the circuit court erroneously denied her parents the right to argue at that hearing. We reject all of Przytarski's arguments.

First, none of Przytarski's arguments actually support her position that her motion was timely. Indeed, the bulk of her brief rehashes the fifteen-year procedural history of this case, alleging that Vallejos criminally abandoned their child early in the litigation (despite the fact that the child has been living with Vallejos for the past ten years), and effectively seeks to re-litigate years of court proceedings leading up to the hearing underlying the appeal. Moreover, the circuit court explained its reasons for denying her motion and properly exercised its discretion. *See Werner v. Hendree*, 2011 WI 10, ¶59, 331 Wis. 2d 511, 795 N.W.2d 423 (2010) (“[T]he circuit court’s denial of a motion to vacate under WIS. STAT. § 806.07 is a discretionary determination that we will not reverse absent an erroneous exercise of discretion.”).

Second, Przytarski's accusations against the circuit court are conclusory and wholly unsupported by the record. Nothing in the record suggests that the circuit conspired with Vallejos, nor do *any* of the court's questions or comments at the hearing underlying this appeal constitute advocacy for Vallejos. We refuse to address these arguments further. *See State v. Pettit*, 171

Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (stating that we may decline to address undeveloped arguments).

Lastly, Przytarski argues that the circuit court erred in finding that her parents were not parties to the action and were therefore unable to participate in the motion hearing. Przytarski argues that her parents filed a motion for grandparent visitation on April 22, 2013, and that two subsequent orders provide for grandparent visitation rights, thereby making them interested parties to her motion to vacate. She also argues that by not allowing the grandparents to participate in the hearing, the circuit court demonstrated bias in favor of Vallejos. Przytarski does not explain how the circuit court's ruling has any effect on the orders pertaining to grandparent visitation—none of the orders Przytarski sought to vacate had any impact on grandparent visitation—nor does the record support Przytarski's contention of bias. Again, her arguments are undeveloped and conclusory. We decline to address them further. *See id.*

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the circuit court.

IT IS ORDERED that the order 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*