



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

May 14, 2026

To:

Hon. Stephen E. Ehlke
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Jeff Okazaki
Register in Probate
Dane County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Patricia Epstein Putney
Electronic Notice

Sheila M. Sullivan
Electronic Notice

William C. Williams
Electronic Notice

Nancy L. Marquardt
309 N. Westfield Road
Madison, WI 53717

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

2024AP562

In re the estate of Audrey J. Marquardt:
Nancy L. Marquardt v. John R. Marquardt (L.C. # 2020PR338)

Before Kloppenburg, 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).

Nancy L. Marquardt, pro se, appeals the final judgment of the informal probate administration of the Estate of Audrey J. Marquardt. Based on 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 affirm.

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

Audrey J. Marquardt died in March 2020. Audrey’s four children, including John R. Marquardt and Nancy L. Marquardt, survived Audrey.² John filed an application for the informal administration of Audrey’s estate and stated his consent to serve as the estate’s personal representative. The circuit court held a hearing and granted the application for the informal administration of Audrey’s estate. The court also granted John domiciliary letters with general powers and duties of a personal representative, and authorized John to administer Audrey’s estate.

Nancy filed a claim against Audrey’s estate, and John moved to dismiss the claim. In January 2021, the circuit court granted the motion to dismiss Nancy’s claim.

In August 2023, John filed a petition for final judgment closing the estate along with a proposed final accounting of the administration of the estate. John requested that the estate’s costs related to the filing of the petition for final judgment be assessed against Nancy’s share of the estate distribution. Nancy objected to the petition for final judgment and the proposed final accounting. The circuit court scheduled a hearing on the petition for final judgment and proposed final accounting.

Before the hearing occurred, John moved the circuit court to compel discovery, averring that Nancy failed to timely respond to discovery requests. John also moved to strike a discovery request made by Nancy, stating that Nancy’s request was “untimely, seeks irrelevant information, [and] contains requests which appear to be made solely for the purposes of

² Because Audrey, John, and Nancy share the same last name, we will refer to them by their first names.

harassment and delay.” Nancy objected to the motion to strike her discovery request. The court granted John’s motion to compel discovery and struck Nancy’s request for discovery.

After the hearing on the petition for final judgment and proposed final accounting, the circuit court denied Nancy’s objection to the proposed final accounting and issued a written order granting the petition for final judgment. In the order, the court found it “just and reasonable that certain of the estate’s costs and fees of the petition for final judgment, the hearing thereon, and related expenses, including actual reasonable attorney’s fees, be paid from the amount otherwise distributable to Nancy....” Nancy timely appealed the order.

On appeal, Nancy argues that the circuit court had “immense bias” in the case. In support of this argument, Nancy asserts that the court did not act on her motions and did not allow her to speak during hearings. Nancy further asserts that the court inappropriately relied on John’s attorney for advice and assistance, and that the court and John’s attorney engaged in ex parte communications.

“When analyzing a judicial bias claim, we always presume that the judge was fair, impartial, and capable of ignoring any biasing influences.” *State v. Gudgeon*, 2006 WI App 143, ¶20, 295 Wis. 2d 189, 720 N.W.2d 114. A person “may rebut the presumption by showing that the appearance of bias reveals a great risk of actual bias. Such a showing constitutes a due process violation.” *State v. Herrmann*, 2015 WI 84, ¶3, 364 Wis. 2d 336, 867 N.W.2d 772 (citations omitted). Here, Nancy generally fails to cite to portions of the record that support her assertions of bias, and we are not persuaded on our review of the record that the circuit court

displayed bias or otherwise acted inappropriately.³ In addition, Nancy fails to explain how the actions she alleges the court to have taken constitute bias. Because her argument of bias is not developed with citations to the record and supporting legal authority, we do not further address it. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(d) (requiring an appellant’s brief to contain “a statement of facts relevant to the issues presented for review, with appropriate references to the record”); *State v. McMorris*, 2007 WI App 231, ¶30, 306 Wis. 2d 79, 742 N.W.2d 322 (this court “may choose not to consider ... arguments that lack proper citations to the record”); *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (this court may decline to address arguments that are undeveloped).

Nancy also asserts that John improperly carried out his personal representative duties, and that John’s attorneys were incompetent, harassed and intimidated Nancy, and intentionally misled the circuit court. However, Nancy fails to present these assertions in the form of an argument as to reviewable error by the circuit court, and Nancy also fails to cite to the record in support of these assertions. Accordingly, we do not further address these assertions. *See Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 646-47; *McMorris*, 306 Wis. 2d 79, ¶30.

Nancy also asserts that the circuit court’s dismissal of her objection to the final accounting was “not legal” and that it was “not legal” for the court to assign costs to Nancy. However, Nancy does not develop an argument with citation to legal authority in a way that illustrates court error. Moreover, Nancy does not support her assertions as to the court’s actions

³ In the limited instances in which Nancy does provide a citation to the record in support of her assertions of bias, the record does not support her assertions. For example, Nancy asserts that the circuit court did not allow her to speak during hearings, but the hearing transcripts show that, in each hearing, Nancy was permitted to present facts, arguments, and replies to statements made by others.

with citation to the record. We therefore decline to address these assertions as undeveloped. *See Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 646-47; *McMorris*, 306 Wis. 2d 79, ¶30.

Nancy also asserts that the circuit court’s dismissal of her claim against the estate was “not legal.” The parties do not discuss whether this court has jurisdiction to review the circuit court’s January 2021 dismissal of Nancy’s claim against the estate. However, even assuming that we have jurisdiction, Nancy does not support this assertion with citation to the record, and she does not develop an argument with citation to legal authority in a manner that illustrates court error. We accordingly decline to address this assertion as undeveloped. *See Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 646-47; *McMorris*, 306 Wis. 2d 79, ¶30.

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the circuit court 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