



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

June 6, 2024

To:

Hon. Kristine A. Snow
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Lorraine Gremminger
Stacie J. Gremminger

Kelly Enright
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dodge County Justice Facility
Electronic Notice

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

2023AP591

Lorraine Gremminger v. Stacie J. Gremminger
(L.C. # 2022CV475)

Before Blanchard, Graham, and Nashold, 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).

Stacie Gremminger appeals a harassment injunction. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2021-22).¹ We summarily affirm.

Lorraine Gremminger sought a temporary restraining order (TRO) and a hearing for a harassment injunction against Stacie Gremminger.² A court commissioner granted the TRO and,

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2021-22 version unless otherwise noted.

² In this opinion, "Gremminger" refers to Stacie Gremminger.

after a hearing, granted the harassment injunction on November 29, 2022. Gremminger sought a hearing de novo in the circuit court. The circuit court held the hearing de novo on December 21, 2022. The circuit court issued the harassment injunction on March 30, 2022.

Gremminger’s brief contains numerous complaints about the circuit court proceedings in this matter. So far as we can tell, Gremminger’s main complaint concerns the delay between the hearing de novo and the issuance of the harassment injunction. The brief fails, however, to develop coherent arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record. “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 arguments that are unsupported by adequate factual and legal citations or are otherwise undeveloped. See *Grothe v. Valley Coatings, Inc.*, 2000 WI App 240, ¶6, 239 Wis. 2d 406, 620 N.W.2d 463 (lack of record citations), *abrogated on other grounds by Wiley v. M.M.N. Laufer Fam. Ltd. P’ship*, 2011 WI App 158, 338 Wis. 2d 178, 807 N.W.2d 236; *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (undeveloped legal arguments). While we make some allowances for the failings of parties who, as here, are not represented by counsel, “[w]e cannot serve as both advocate and judge,” *Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 647, and will not scour the record to develop viable, fact-supported legal theories on the appellant’s behalf, *Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d at 337.

Here, Gremminger has failed to develop her arguments legally or to support them factually. We affirm the circuit court on that basis.

Therefore,

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.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals