



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

June 4, 2026

To:

Hon. Kristine A. Snow
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Kelly Enright
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dodge County Justice Facility
Electronic Notice

Johnai V. Kadah Jr.
P.O. Box 34
616 TN-76
White House, TN 37188

Rhonda Juanita Monemou
228 E. Industrial Dr., #1
Beaver Dam, WI 53916

Cassel Villarreal
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP1964

In re the Paternity of Z.A.M.: Rhonda Juanita Monemou v.
Johnai V. Kadah, Jr. (L.C. # 2021PA15PJ)

Before Graham, P.J., 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).

Johnai Kadah, Jr., pro se, appeals a circuit court order that modified legal custody and physical placement of the parties' minor child in post-paternity proceedings. After reviewing 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 December 2023, Rhonda Monemou moved to modify legal custody and physical placement as to the child she shares with Kadah. In April 2024, Kadah also moved to modify custody and placement. In September 2025, the circuit court held a trial on the disputed issues of custody and placement. Following trial, the court issued an oral ruling modifying custody and placement, and issued a written order consistent with its oral ruling. Kadah appeals that order.

Kadah’s brief contains complaints about the circuit court proceedings in this matter. The brief fails, however, to develop coherent arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record to show why the circuit court erred as to the specific decisions he appeals. 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 Family 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). While 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, *State v. Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d 328, 337, 600 N.W.2d 39 (Ct. App. 1999).

In sum, Kadah has failed to develop his arguments legally or to support them factually. Although we affirm the circuit court for that reason, we choose to briefly explain why Kadah’s two discernable arguments, as best we understand them, have no merit.

First, Kadah contends that the circuit court made its legal custody and physical placement decisions “without viewing all the video facts and information” and ordered “no contact” between Kadah and the child “without any evidence supporting [that] decision.” However,

Kadah does not provide any citations to the record to support that argument. While the court awarded sole legal custody and primary physical placement to Monemou, it also ordered that Kadah have video visits and supervised in-person visits with the child. The court explained that it considered the evidence presented at trial, including the video evidence, in making those decisions. Accordingly, we reject this argument.

Second, Kadah argues that social workers in this case violated ethical standards by contributing to parental alienation of Kadah from his daughter. Again, Kadah does not provide any citations to the record to support this assertion. Moreover, Kadah does not explain how that alleged conduct is relevant to this appeal from the circuit court's decisions as to legal custody and physical placement. Accordingly, we reject this argument as well.

In addition, while the respondent failed to file a brief, the guardian ad litem (GAL) chose to participate in this appeal and filed a brief taking the position of Monemou, the respondent. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(6m). The GAL's brief argues that the circuit court's decisions were a proper exercise of discretion, relying on the appropriate law and the facts of records. *See Gould v. Gould*, 116 Wis. 2d 493, 497, 342 N.W.2d 426 (1984) (child custody and placement determinations are "committed to the sound discretion of the circuit court"). Kadah failed to file a reply brief. By failing to refute the GAL's brief, Kadah has conceded that the arguments in that brief are correct. *See United Co-op. v. Frontier FS Co-op.*, 2007 WI App 197, ¶39, 304 Wis. 2d 750, 738 N.W.2d 578 (generally, the failure to refute a proposition asserted in a brief may be taken as a concession).

Therefore,

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

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

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals