



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 II**

February 25, 2026

To:

Hon. Jodi L. Meier  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Moondette Moscoso Reeves  
Electronic Notice

Rebecca Matoska-Mentink  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Kenosha County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Timothy David Reeves  
Electronic Notice

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

---

2025AP174

Timothy David Reeves v. Moondette Moscoso Reeves  
(L.C. #2022FA842)

Before Gundrum, Grogan, and Lazar, 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).**

Moondette Moscoso Reeves, pro se, appeals from a November 2023 Decision; December 2023 judgment of divorce; an October 2024 circuit court order holding her in contempt and continuing prior purge conditions for her failure to pay her ex-husband Timothy David Reeves<sup>1</sup> a court-ordered amount for reimbursements, attorney's fees, and an equalization payment; and December 2024 order denying her motion to reopen her divorce proceedings.<sup>2</sup> She

---

<sup>1</sup> This court refers to the parties by their first names because they share the same surname.

<sup>2</sup> Although not mentioned in her notices of appeal, Moondette argues in her brief with respect to two additional orders: a March 2024 order holding her in contempt and setting the initial purge conditions for her failure to pay Timothy a court-ordered amount for reimbursements, attorney's fees, and an

(continued)

also makes several claims of procedural and judicial irregularities.<sup>3</sup> 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. For the reasons that follow, we affirm the judgment and orders.

The relevant facts are as follows. Moondette and Timothy divorced in November 2023. The circuit court ordered Moondette to pay Timothy an amount for reimbursements, attorney’s fees, and an equalization payment, which she failed to timely pay. Timothy sought an order to show cause why Moondette should not be found in contempt. At a March 2024 show cause hearing, Moondette testified she did not have the financial means to comply with the order. The court did not find her at all credible, held her in contempt, and imposed a penalty of 120 days in jail if she failed to comply with the purge condition of making monthly payments of her debt to Timothy. The court imposed an additional purge condition barring Moondette from making

---

equalization payment; and a June 2024 order denying her motion to adjourn a hearing to review her purge conditions. Those two orders, not before the court in this appeal, were actually previously upheld by this court, with one exception. *See Reeves v. Reeves*, No. 2024AP1399, unpublished slip op. (WI App Apr. 30, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Moondette filed notices of appeal twice in January 2025 and once in March 2025 seeking review of the circuit court’s December 2024 order denying her motion to reopen the divorce judgment, as well as several other orders and the judgment of divorce in the case. Those notices have been included in this single appeal.

This court notes that it may lack jurisdiction over Moondette’s appeal for lack of timely filing notices of appeal. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.10(1) (2023-24) (“The filing of a timely notice of appeal is necessary to give the court jurisdiction over the appeal.”); *La Crosse Trust Co. v. Bluske*, 99 Wis. 2d 427, 428, 299 N.W.2d 302 (Ct. App. 1980) (holding that court of appeals “has no jurisdiction of an appeal which is not timely taken”). While the parties were asked in a May 2025 order to brief the jurisdictional issue, neither did. Assuming without deciding that this court has jurisdiction, this court concludes that Moondette has not met her burden of demonstrating the factual and legal bases for her claims that have not already been decided by this court.

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

disparaging remarks on social media or to any third party about Timothy, their attorneys, or past and present employees of the court.<sup>4</sup>

In May 2024, Timothy filed a request for a purge review hearing, which was set for June 2024, on the grounds that Moondette had failed to make payments towards the debt she owed him and had made disparaging remarks about Timothy and court officials in violation of the purge conditions. In May 2024, Moondette sought adjournment of the purge hearing, which the circuit court denied. At the hearing, Moondette did not appear, and the court ordered her to make a partial payment of her debt to Timothy by June 7 or report directly to jail to serve a 120-day commitment. The court also stated that the order not to make disparaging remarks would be a continued purge order.

Although not identified in her notices of appeal, Moondette seeks relief from the March 2024 order of the circuit court finding her in contempt for nonpayment and setting the purge condition related to disparaging remarks; and from the June 2024 order denying her request for adjournment of the purge review hearing. Her claims related to these orders were previously considered and decided by this court in *Reeves v. Reeves*, No. 2024AP1399, unpublished slip op. (WI App Apr. 30, 2025), wherein this court reversed the March 2024 contempt order insofar as it imposed the non-disparagement condition but otherwise affirmed the circuit court's orders. Thus, these claims have already been resolved.

---

<sup>4</sup> In July 24, 2024, Moondette appealed from circuit court orders finding her in contempt of court, setting certain purge conditions, and denying her request to adjourn a purge review hearing. In an order dated April 30, 2024, this court affirmed all of those orders except “insofar as they pertain to restrict Moondette’s ability to ‘disseminat[e] ... disparaging remarks on social media or to any third party about the other party, attorneys, or past and present employees of the court.’” *Reeves*, No. 2024AP1399, ¶1. The remaining purge conditions were upheld and remained in place. *Id.*

Moondette also appeals from the October 2024 order maintaining the purge conditions. With the exception of the non-disparagement condition that we have concluded was inappropriately imposed, the remaining conditions were effectively upheld by this court's decision in *Reeves*. Moondette has raised no new arguments warranting a reconsideration of that opinion.

Finally, Moondette appeals from the November 2023 Decision and December 2023 judgment of divorce, claiming that the circuit court unfairly divided the marital property. She alleges she was coerced by the court into signing a quitclaim deed to the home she shared with Thomas. She further claims that “[s]everal judgments and orders in this case were issued by judges who lacked authority at the time of signing.” She alleges “ex parte communications” between opposing counsel and court personnel, and misrepresentation by her attorney concerning marital property and agreements. With respect to these claims, her brief fails to develop arguments that apply relevant legal authority to facts on the Record and instead relies on conclusory assertions. This court declines to review issues inadequately briefed.<sup>5</sup> See *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992).

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment and orders of the circuit court are summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

---

<sup>5</sup> We also note that Moondette has filed several notices of purge payments, and a motion to contest purge amount and request for modification of purge payment process. Those are to be addressed by the circuit court, so we do not address them in this appeal.

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

---

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