



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

April 8, 2013

To:

Hon. Juan B. Colas
Circuit Court Judge
215 South Hamilton, Br.10, Rm. 7103
Madison, WI 53703

Carlo Esqueda
Clerk of Circuit Court
Room 1000
215 South Hamilton
Madison, WI 53703

Mark J. Steichen
Marta T. Meyers
Boardman & Clark, LLP
P.O. Box 927
Madison, WI 53701-0927

Bratislav Stankovic
Veljko Vlahovic 18/19
1000 Skopje,
Republic of Macedonia

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

2011AP2262	In re the marriage of: Ana Garic-Stankovic v. Bratislav Stankovic (L.C. # 2009FA405)
2012AP662	In re the Finding of Contempt in re the Marriage of Ana Garic-Stankovic v. Bratislav Stankovic: Ana Garic-Stankovic v. Bratislav Stankovic (L.C. # 2009FA405)

Before Lundsten, P.J., Sherman and Blanchard, JJ.

Bratislav Stankovic appeals a divorce judgment and an order finding him in contempt for failure to pay child support.¹ After reviewing the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that these cases are appropriate for summary disposition pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2011-12).² We affirm because the appellant's briefs fail to develop cogent legal arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record. See *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47,

¹ We consolidate these appeals on our own motion.

² All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2011-12 version.

492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (we need not address undeveloped arguments); *Grothe v. Valley Coatings, Inc.*, 2000 WI App 240, ¶6, 239 Wis. 2d 406, 620 N.W.2d 463 (we need not address unsupported assertions of fact); *see also* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(d) and (e) (setting forth the requirements for briefs).

Broadly speaking, Stankovic challenges a host of factual and discretionary determinations made by the circuit court based on assertions of bias, rather than on any identifiable legal errors. Although we could refuse to address any of the appellant's arguments based upon the deficiencies of his briefs, we will comment briefly on his allegations of bias.

Stankovic contends that the circuit court judge must have been biased against him because the judge looked up information about Stankovic on the Internet and because the attorney representing Stankovic's ex-wife supported the judge's campaign for office. Neither contention is persuasive. As to looking at information about Stankovic on-line, Stankovic does not explain what the judge would have found that would have influenced him against Stankovic. It is just as likely that the judge was simply curious about Stankovic's extensive resume of accomplishments. Similarly, Stankovic has not provided any authority to suggest that an attorney's expressed support for a judge's campaign requires subsequent recusal by the judge on all of the attorney's cases. To the contrary, such indications of support are commonplace, and would not lead any reasonable attorney to believe that a judge was more or less likely to rule in the attorney's favor on any particular matter.

IT IS ORDERED that the divorce judgment and contempt order are summarily affirmed under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Court of Appeals