



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 II

June 24, 2026

To:

Hon. Gerad T. Dougvillo
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:

2025AP2165

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 appeals pro se from an order entered in September 2025¹ staying a sentence requiring her to continue making payments in compliance with previous court orders and to cover attorney fees from Timothy David Reeves in the amount of \$5,414. Based upon our review of the briefs and Record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate

¹ This order is titled "ORDER OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2025," but it was not signed and filed until September 22, 2025. We refer to it as the September 2025 order throughout the opinion.

for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).² For the reasons that follow, we affirm the order.

Background

Moondette and Timothy were divorced on November 29, 2023, after four years of marriage. 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 that she did not have the financial means to comply with the order. The court did not find her credible, held her in contempt, and imposed a penalty of 120 days in jail if she failed to comply with the condition of making monthly payments of her debt to Timothy.

In May 2024, Timothy filed a request for a review hearing, set for June 2024, on the grounds that Moondette had failed to make payments toward the debt she owed him and had made disparaging remarks about Timothy and court officials in violation of the purge conditions. At the hearing, Moondette did not appear, and the court ordered her to make a partial payment of her debt to Timothy by June 7th or report directly to jail to serve a 120-day commitment. She ultimately made the partial payment, and the court stayed its June 4th commitment order, ordered her to continue making payments in accordance with court orders, and immediately released her from jail.

² All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

In October 2024, Timothy asked the circuit court to lift the stay of the June 4th commitment order because Moondette failed to make the required \$900 payments in both September and October. On October 29th, the court held a purge review hearing and again found Moondette to be noncompliant with making her court-ordered payments. In July 2025, the court found Moondette remained willfully noncompliant with her monthly payments, entered orders lifting the stay, and ordered her confined for 120 days in the Kenosha County Jail. Moondette was then taken into custody at the Kenosha County Jail.

Moondette was subsequently released from incarceration even though she still failed to make the court-ordered payments. In September 2025, the circuit court entered an order: (1) re-effectuating the 120-day commitment to the Kenosha County Jail; (2) staying the sentence and requiring payment of balances from past orders; and (3) awarding attorney fees to Timothy in the amount of \$5,414. Moondette appeals from this September 2025 order.

Discussion

Moondette argues that: (1) the circuit court displayed bias and erroneously exercised its discretion in handling the divorce proceedings; (2) her due process rights were violated because she was allegedly coerced to sign the quit claim deed; (3) the property division and divorce judgment were substantively and procedurally unfair; (4) the circuit court improperly enforced purge orders despite her inability to pay; (5) opposing counsel engaged in misrepresentations and unethical conduct; (6) the circuit court failed to properly consider her medical, personal, and financial hardships when issuing orders; and (7) the September 2025 order continued a pattern of bias, erroneous exercise of discretion, and procedural unfairness by the court.

This appeal invokes many issues already resolved by past decisions of this court.³ Each of Moondette’s first six arguments were previously decided by this court and will not be addressed again. Thus, the only issue we consider on appeal is Moondette’s final argument: whether the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion when it recommitted Moondette to Kenosha County Jail, stayed the sentence, required payment of past balances, and awarded attorney fees in Timothy’s favor in its September 2025 order. Upon review of the Record and the briefs, we affirm the order of the circuit court.

On appeal, an appellant bears the burden to demonstrate that the circuit court erred. *Gaethke v. Pozder*, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381. Moondette’s brief fails to comply with the rules of appellate procedure. She fails to cite to the Record or adequately support her arguments with citations to legal authority, both of which are required under the appellate rules. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(e). While we recognize that Moondette appeals pro se, she must still abide by the same rules as attorneys. *See Waushara County v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992). In failing to abide by the rules of appellate procedure or cite to the Record, Moondette has failed to satisfy her burden, and therefore, we reject her arguments.

In addition to failing to comply with the rules of appellate procedure, Moondette’s brief fails to sufficiently develop any legal arguments, and “[w]e will not address undeveloped arguments.” *Clean Wis., Inc. v. PSC*, 2005 WI 93, ¶180 n.40, 282 Wis. 2d 250, 700 N.W.2d 768. An appellate judge cannot properly serve as both advocate and judge, *State v. Pettit*, 171

³ *See Reeves v. Reeves*, No. 2024AP1399, unpublished slip op. (WI App Apr. 30, 2025); *Reeves v. Reeves*, No. 2025AP1614, unpublished slip op. (WI App Dec. 10, 2025); *Reeves v. Reeves*, No. 2025AP174, unpublished op. and order (WI App Feb. 25, 2026).

Wis. 2d 627, 647, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992), and thus, it is inappropriate for us to “abandon our neutrality to develop arguments” for Moondette. *Industrial Risk Insurers v. American Eng’g Testing, Inc.*, 2009 WI App 62, ¶25, 318 Wis. 2d 148, 769 N.W.2d 82. Her appeal fails on this basis alone.

In sum, Moondette attempts to re-litigate settled decisions, fails to abide by the rules of appellate procedure, and inadequately develops her arguments. Moondette did not adequately show, with citations to the Record or to legal authority, that the September 2025 order was an erroneous exercise of discretion by the circuit court. Because it is Moondette’s burden to demonstrate how the court erred, her failure to comply with appellate procedure and proffering only insufficiently developed arguments means her appeal falls far short of her burden. Thus, this court affirms the decision of the circuit court.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed pursuant to 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