



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 21, 2026

To:

Hon. Timothy J. Gaskell
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Eleanor Rose Landis
P.O. Box 362
Viroqua, WI 54665

Sheila Olson
Clerk of Circuit Court
Vernon County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Nikki C. Swayne
Abt Swayne Law
210 N. Main Street
P.O. Box 128
Westby, WI 54667

Douglas Landis
532 N. Dagmar Road
Dagmar, MT 59219

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

2025AP1814

In re the marriage of: Eleanor Rose Landis v. Douglas Landis
(L.C. # 2000FA69)

Before Graham, P.J., Kloppenburg, 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).

Douglas Landis appeals orders addressing his child support arrears. Based on our review of 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).¹ We affirm.

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

In an earlier appeal between these parties, we set out the relevant history:

Douglas and Eleanor divorced in 2001. As part of the divorce judgment, Douglas was to pay a monthly amount of child support. In addition, a marital balance sheet indicated that Douglas had accumulated arrears for temporary child support and temporary maintenance during the pendency of the divorce. In 2015, the circuit court issued an order finding that Douglas had, by that time, accumulated a total of \$39,787.28 in child support arrears. The order also stated that he owed interest of \$50,014.89 on the child support arrears and that he still had \$12,754.95 in maintenance arrears.

In 2023, Douglas filed a motion to modify his support obligations. He argued that the total amount of his obligations had been miscalculated because he was never credited for an offset to his support and other financial obligations based on the property division, as contemplated by the divorce judgment. He also argued that he filed his motion as soon as he became aware of the miscalculation, and that the circumstances entitled him to relief under WIS. STAT. § 806.07.

Based on the divorce judgment and related materials filed at the time of the parties' divorce, the circuit court found that Douglas should have received a \$10,364.50 credit. The court also found that if the credit had been apportioned equally between Douglas's then-existing child support and maintenance arrears, his child support arrears would have been reduced to \$10,537.75 and his maintenance arrears would have been reduced to \$9,817.75. Additionally, the court found that Douglas's motion established extraordinary circumstances sufficient to justify relief from a judgment or order pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 806.07(1)(h). However, the court also found that Douglas had not brought his motion within a reasonable time as required by § 806.07(2). Accordingly, the court denied his request to modify his support obligations.

Landis v. Landis, No. 2024AP831, unpublished op. and order at 2-3 (WI App Feb. 20, 2025).

In that appeal, we reversed and remanded with directions for the circuit court to “modify Douglas’s support obligations consistent with the court’s factual finding that Douglas should have received a \$10,364.50 credit against his support obligations as they existed at the time of the divorce.” *Id.* at 4.

On remand, in June 2025 the circuit court issued an order granting Douglas a credit in that amount against his child support arrears. Douglas appeals. He argues that the circuit court's finding in January 2024 that he should have received a credit for \$10,364.50 was erroneous and that the amount should have been higher. He argues that, because this court was unaware of that error during the earlier appeal, we directed the circuit court to give him an incorrect amount of credit on remand, and we should now reverse the circuit court order and direct that court to enter a new order with a higher amount of credit.

We must reject this argument because the circuit court's January 2024 finding is not before us in this appeal. This appeal from the June 2025 order brings before us only prior *nonfinal* orders. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.10(4). The January 2024 finding is not a prior nonfinal order. Instead, the January 2024 finding was part of the circuit court's findings that went into the final order that Douglas has already appealed, and that resulted in this court's earlier opinion. The time for Douglas to contest that January 2024 finding was in that appeal, at the same time that he was arguing that the circuit court erred by concluding that Douglas had not filed his motion within a reasonable time.

IT IS ORDERED that the orders appealed from are summarily affirmed under 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