



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

January 13, 2026

To:

Hon. Kevin E. Martens
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Jaquayo R. Spears
Electronic Notice

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

Melesha S. Spears
6609 N. Bourbon Street
Milwaukee, WI 53224

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

2024AP1457

Melesha S. Spears v. Jaquayo R. Spears (L.C. # 2022FA4671)

Before White, C.J., Colón, P.J., and Donald, 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).

Jaquayo R. Spears, pro se, appeals from a final judgment of divorce entered by the circuit court on June 28, 2024, divorcing Jaquayo and Melesha S. Spears. On appeal, Jaquayo raises several issues for review generally challenging the circuit court's rulings pertaining to "property division, financial disclosures, spousal support, and attorney fees." 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 (2023-24).¹ We summarily affirm.

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

In short, Jaquayo’s arguments are not adequately developed. His arguments are supported by nothing more than general statements that lack any legal analysis or reasoning. We will not address his arguments because they are not adequately developed. *See State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992). In addition, Jaquayo fails to provide adequate legal authority in support of his 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. Jaquayo’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.*

Additionally, Jaquayo failed to file a reply brief responding to the arguments made in Melesha’s respondent’s brief. Propositions asserted by a respondent on appeal and not disputed by the appellant in the reply brief are taken as admitted. *See United Coop. v. Frontier FS Coop.*, 2007 WI App 197, ¶39, 304 Wis. 2d 750, 738 N.W.2d 578 (stating that the failure to refute a proposition asserted in a response brief may be taken as a concession).

Even if we were to develop arguments on Jaquayo’s behalf and overlook his failure to file a reply, the record on appeal is inadequate for this court to conduct a meaningful review because Jaquayo failed to make any transcripts a part of the appellate record. Importantly, the record lacks the transcript of the court trial at which the circuit court made its oral findings and addressed the maintenance and other support obligations Jaquayo challenges on appeal. As the appellant, it is Jaquayo’s duty to ensure that the record is sufficient to address the issues raised on appeal. *See State v. Provo*, 2004 WI App 97, ¶19, 272 Wis. 2d 837, 681 N.W.2d 272. In the absence of transcripts, this court must assume that every fact essential to sustain the circuit

court's exercise of discretion is supported by the record, and we do so here. *See Fiumefreddo v. McLean*, 174 Wis. 2d 10, 26-27, 496 N.W.2d 226 (Ct. App. 1993).

For all the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment is summarily affirmed. *See* 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