



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 IV**

September 11, 2025

To:

Hon. Rhonda L. Lanford  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Tatyana M. J. Galmore  
2010 W. Broadway, Apt. 105  
Madison, WI 53717

Jeff Okazaki  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Dane County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Caleb J. Retelle  
54 S. Gammon Rd., Apt. G  
Madison, WI 53717

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

---

2024AP754

In re the Paternity of A.Z.R.: Caleb J. Retelle v. Tatyana M.J.  
Galmore (L.C. # 2021PA107PJ)

Before Blanchard, Nashold, and Taylor, 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).**

Caleb Retelle, pro se, appeals a circuit court order that was entered following a hearing held on April 15, 2024, in this post-adjudication paternity case. In the order, the circuit court denied Retelle's motion for judicial recusal and granted Tatyana Galmore's motion to enforce placement. After reviewing the appellant's brief and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).<sup>1</sup> We summarily affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

The appellant’s brief contains numerous complaints about the circuit court proceedings in this matter. However, the brief fails to develop coherent arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record, and instead relies largely upon conclusory assertions. “A party must do more than simply toss a bunch of concepts into the air with the hope that either the trial 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, *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 (lack of record citations); *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (undeveloped legal arguments). Although 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, Retelle has failed to develop his arguments legally or to support them factually. Therefore, we affirm the circuit court on that basis. Due to the lack of a developed argument for reversal, it does not matter that no respondent’s brief was filed in this appeal.

The appellant also filed a “motion for judgment” requesting, among other relief, that this court enter judgment in the appellant’s favor, impose sanctions against the respondent, and vacate the circuit court’s ruling. In the motion, as in his brief, the appellant fails to apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record. We deny the motion on that basis.

IT IS ORDERED that the order is summarily affirmed under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the “motion for judgment” is denied.

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

---

*Samuel A. Christensen*  
*Clerk of Court of Appeals*