



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

August 19, 2026

To:

Hon. Ryan J. Hetzel
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Ger Xiong
353 Oak Street
Oakfield, WI 53065

Connie Mueller
Clerk of Circuit Court
Ozaukee County Justice Center
Electronic Notice

Jia Xiong
353 Oak Street
Oakfield, WI 53065

Molly Stacy Fitzgerald
Electronic Notice

Mai Hlee Xiong
Electronic Notice

Scott R. Halloin
Electronic Notice

Chao Yang
9855 Hawthorne Lane
Mequon, WI 53097

Sheila Lea Shadman Emerson
Electronic Notice

Kay Yang
P.O. Box 217
Thiensville, WI 53092

Enduring Love International Center, LLC
11301 West Lake Park Drive
Milwaukee, WI 53224

Kenji Yang
P.O. Box 43501
Minneapolis, MN 55443

Mailee Hang
620 West Briarknoll Court
Saukville, WI 53080

Tony Yang
8201 North Whitney Road
Fox Point, WI 53217

Van Tou Hang
620 West Briarknoll Court
Saukville, WI 53080

Ue Yang
3722 South 18th Street
Sheboygan, WI 53081

Sydney Morales
13310 4th Avenue South
Zimmerman, MN 55398

Mai L. Vang
3722 South 18th Street
Sheboygan, WI 53081

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

2025AP1364

Long Lee v. Kay Yang (L.C. #2022CV162)

Before Lazar, P.J., Gundrum, and Grogan, 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).

Mai Hlee Xiong appeals, pro se, from circuit court orders issued in April 2025 and May 2025. 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 (2023-24).¹ For the following reasons, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

This appeal arises from an action filed in May 2022 pursuant to Wisconsin’s Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, WIS. STAT. ch. 242 (2021-22)² by Long Lee and other plaintiffs³ (collectively, Lee) against Xiong and other defendants,⁴ which resulted in a September 2022

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

² Since this action was filed, the title of the statute was changed in 2023 to the “Uniform Voidable Transactions Law.” WIS. STAT. § 242.13.

³ The plaintiffs are Long Lee, Miana Lee, David Blong, Mee Lee, and Unlimited Wealth, LLC.

⁴ The defendants are Kay Yang, Chao Yang, Kenji Yang, Sydney Morales, Mailee Hang, Vang Tou Hang, Ger Xiong, Jia Xiong, Mai Hlee Xiong, and Enduring Love International Center, LLC. Mai Hlee Xiong is Kay Yang’s sister and a “[r]elative[.]” See WIS. STAT. § 242.01(11) (2021-22) (“‘Relative’ means an individual related by blood within the 3rd degree of kinship as computed under [WIS. STAT. §] 990.001(16), a spouse or an individual related to a spouse within the 3rd degree as so computed, and includes an individual in an adoptive relationship within the 3rd degree.”).

default judgment against Xiong after she failed to answer the complaint.⁵ The court amended the judgment in December 2022 to reflect a typographical error in the damages award and to add taxed costs, for a total judgment amount of \$2,445,564.41.

Xiong filed a motion to vacate the December 2022 Amended Default Judgment, pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 806.07(1)(h). The circuit court denied Xiong's motion at a March 2025 hearing and entered a written order in April 2025.

Meanwhile, in March 2025, Lee filed a motion to hold Xiong and other defendants in contempt of court under WIS. STAT. § 785.04, for willfully making additional fraudulent transfers of the properties that were the subject of the circuit court's December 2022 order. In May 2025, the circuit court found Xiong in contempt and directed her to pay \$144,962 to Lee.

Xiong appeals from the circuit court's April 2025 and May 2025 orders.

⁵ Under WIS. STAT. § 806.02, if the defendant does not answer the complaint, the allegations of the complaint are deemed admitted, as the circuit court found here.

By way of background, before the proceedings at issue here, in Ozaukee County Circuit Court Case No. 2021CV137, filed April 5, 2021, Lee brought claims against Kay Yang and her businesses to enforce a July 2020 restitution order issued by the Wisconsin Department of Financial Institutions (DFI). See *Lee v. Vang*, No. 24-2153-rmb, 2026 WL 893714, at *1 (Bankr. E.D. Wis. Mar. 31, 2026) ("Plaintiff[] Long Lee ... [is a] victim[] of Kay Yang, who ran a fraudulent investment scheme in Wisconsin."). Yang had been ordered to pay nearly \$17 million to over 40 investors, including Lee. *Id.* In April 2022, Lee obtained summary judgment against Yang in the amount of \$2.4 million. *Id.* After obtaining the judgment against Kay Yang, Lee sued Yang, her sister Xiong, and other relatives in the action underlying this appeal.

DISCUSSION

Xiong claims that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion by (1) denying her motion to vacate the Amendment Default Judgment, alleging lack of personal jurisdiction and lack of notice; and (2) finding her in contempt of court.

To start, we observe that Xiong’s arguments generally lack citations to relevant legal authority. While we acknowledge that Xiong is a pro se litigant for whom “some leniency may be allowed,” *Waushara County v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992), pro se litigants “are bound by the same rules that apply to attorneys on appeal,” *id.*, and “we will not abandon our neutrality to develop arguments.” *Industrial Risk Insurers v. American Eng’g Testing, Inc.*, 2009 WI App 62, ¶25, 318 Wis. 2d 148, 769 N.W.2d 82. Where Xiong’s arguments are not supported by legal authority, we need not address them. See *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (“Arguments unsupported by references to legal authority will not be considered.”). Nevertheless, in the interest of completeness, we will address Xiong’s individual arguments as best we are able to discern them.

We first address Xiong’s claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion by denying her motion to vacate the Amendment Default Judgment. “‘Whether to grant relief from judgment under WIS. STAT. § 806.07(1)(h) is a decision within the discretion of the circuit court,’ which we review under the erroneous exercise of discretion standard.” *Miller v. Hanover Ins. Co.*, 2010 WI 75, ¶29, 326 Wis. 2d 640, 785 N.W.2d 493. “A circuit court erroneously exercises its discretion if it applies an improper legal standard or makes a decision not reasonably supported by the facts of record.” *Weborg v. Jenny*, 2012 WI 67, ¶41, 341 Wis. 2d 668, 816 N.W.2d 191 (citation omitted). “We will not find an [erroneous exercise] of discretion

if there is a reasonable basis for the trial court’s determination, and we generally will ‘look for reasons to sustain a trial court’s discretionary ruling[s].’” *Erbstoesz by Leyes v. American Cas. Co.*, 169 Wis. 2d 637, 644, 486 N.W.2d 549 (Ct. App. 1992) (second alteration in original).

Xiong argues that she was not properly served and therefore the circuit court lacked personal jurisdiction over her. Although Xiong forfeited these arguments by failing to raise them in the circuit court, see *State v. Huebner*, 2000 WI 59, ¶10, 235 Wis. 2d 486, 611 N.W.2d 727 (“Issues that are not preserved at the circuit court, even alleged constitutional errors, generally will not be considered on appeal.”), even if we overlook the forfeiture, the arguments fail because she provides no factual support for her contentions and offers only conclusory legal assertions. Her principal argument is that, because she resides in Michigan, she could not have been properly served with a summons commencing a Wisconsin action. She cites to outdated case law and overlooks current statutes. The circuit court found that Xiong was properly served. Indeed, the Record shows that the process server personally delivered the Summons to Xiong in Michigan on June 2, 2022. See WIS. STAT. RULE 801.11(1)(a) (“A court of this state ... may exercise personal jurisdiction over a defendant by service of a summons ... [b]y [the plaintiff] personally serving the summons upon the defendant either within or without this state.”). With respect to Xiong’s argument that she did not receive proper notice of the Amendment Default Judgment, the Record reflects that, according to the certificate of service for the Amendment Default Judgment, the proposed order was served by United States mail on November 29, 2022 to Xiong. As stated by the circuit court, “there is nothing in this record to indicate why” Xiong

waited two years to file her motion to vacate.⁶ We conclude the circuit court did not erroneously exercise its discretion by denying Xiong’s motion to vacate the Amendment Default Judgment for lack of proper service, lack of personal jurisdiction, or lack of notice.

We turn next to Xiong’s claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion by finding her in contempt of court in its May 2025 order. She revisits her argument that the court did not have personal jurisdiction over her. She also asserts that the court did not have authority to “affect title to or control property located in another state.” Xiong misstates the circuit court’s order, which did not affect title or control out-of-state property, but rather issued a remedial contempt sanction against Xiong for her actions.

“The legislature has regulated contempt in WIS. STAT. ch. 785. Contempt of court is defined as intentional misconduct or disobedience towards the authority of a court Contempt may be punished either by a punitive sanction or a remedial sanction.” *Frisch v Henrichs*, 2007 WI 102, ¶33, 304 Wis. 2d 1, 736 N.W.2d 85 (citing to WIS. STAT. § 785.02).

The circuit court found that:

Xiong benefitted from fraudulent transfer by ... Yang with ... funds [derived from Lee’s financial investments] being utilized to purchase the Newcastle Drive, Warren, MI property (titled in Mai Hlee Xiong’s name).

After proper service on ... Xiong, an Order for Default Judgment, Judgment and Writ of Attachment was entered against ... Xiong and the Newcastle property ... when the [c]ourt found the allegations of the complaint were deemed admitted. The

⁶ WISCONSIN STAT. § 806.07(2) states, “[t]he motion [for relief from a judgment or order] shall be made within a reasonable time[.]”

[c]ourt entered judgment against ... Xiong ... and attached a lien in said amount on the Newcastle property[.]

...

As of September 8, 2022 any ownership interest ... Xiong had in ... [the] Newcastle property had been []voided and [she did not] ha[ve] any remaining ownership interest after September 8, 2022.

A transfer by a debtor cannot be made unless the debtor has legal rights in the asset transferred (see WIS. STAT. [§] 242.06 (4)).

... Xiong after September 8, 2022 [did not] ha[ve] any legal rights in said propert[y] and could not legally transfer or encumber the propert[y].

On November 2, 2022, ... Xiong took out a second mortgage with Discover Bank in the amount of \$144,962 which pulled out all remaining equity that she had in the Newcastle property.

...

... The [c]ourt notes that a judgment doesn't have to specifically state that, by entering the judgment and attaching the lien, the [d]efendants no longer had any ownership interest to be able to transfer or encumber the property.

Thus, the circuit court found that Xiong intentionally obtained a mortgage on a property that was subject to a lien by the default judgment, and the court ordered Xiong to pay \$144,962 to restore Lee to his financial position at the time of the default judgment. The court ordered the amount to be paid by July 21, 2025, and if it was not paid by that date, an additional sum of \$2,000 per day would be imposed until it was paid.

We conclude that the circuit court did not err in finding Xiong in contempt of court and imposing a remedial sanction to restore Lee's financial position to the time before Xiong unlawfully took out a second mortgage on the Newcastle property, in which she did not have any legal rights.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the orders of the circuit court are 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