



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 I

August 25, 2026

To:

Hon. T. Christopher Dee
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Lindsey M. Anderson
Electronic Notice

Anna Hodges
Clerk of Circuit Court
Milwaukee County Appeals Processing
Division
Electronic Notice

Tashica S. Danzy
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP1484

LaTanya G. Dukes v. Tashica S. Danzy (L.C. # 2020FA6025)

Before Donald, C.J., Colón, P.J., and Geenen, J.

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).

Tashica S. Danzy, pro se, appeals from a judgment of divorce entered following a court trial. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).¹ The judgment is summarily affirmed.

Danzy and LaTanya G. Dukes were married in Canada in 2004. They have one minor child who was born in 2010. Dukes filed for divorce in Milwaukee County in December 2020.

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

Following a court trial, the circuit court granted a divorce, which incorporated a partial marital settlement agreement, in April 2024. The judgment of divorce was entered on May 15, 2024.

Danzy has appealed from the judgment of divorce, but it is unclear which portion or portions of that judgment she seeks to challenge. In the introductory “issues presented” portion of her brief, Danzy lists four issues: whether Wisconsin had jurisdiction to hear the case, whether the case was “heard fairly,” whether the circuit court “appropriately used discretion when ruling on the case,” and whether an attorney assigned to aid Danzy was “fully representing [her] in the best interest of his client.” In her argument section, Danzy identifies four different issues: “[v]alidity of foreign marriage,” “parental rights,” “jurisdiction for 2004 Canadian same sex marriage,” and “[m]arital property vs [a]ssets owned prior to the marriage.” Danzy’s “statement of case and facts” asserts several complaints about the proceedings, but these are never further developed into coherent arguments. The “argument” section of the brief contains conclusory assertions, along with statutory and other references, but no connection is ever made between those assertions, the legal authority, and the facts of record.

“A party must do more than simply toss a bunch of concepts into the air with the hope that either the trial court or the opposing party will arrange them into viable and fact-supported legal theories.” *State v. Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d 328, 337, 600 N.W.2d 39 (Ct. App. 1999). This court is not required to consider arguments that are unsupported by adequate factual and legal citation 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; see also *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992). It is true that we may allow pro se litigants some leniency when it comes to satisfying requirements of the court. See

Waushara Cnty. v. Graf, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992). However, Danzy’s brief “is so lacking in organization and substance that for us to decide [her] issues, we would first have to develop them.” **Pettit**, 171 Wis. 2d at 647. We cannot serve as both advocate and judge, *see id.*, so we will not abandon our neutrality to develop a party’s arguments, *see State v. Gulrud*, 140 Wis. 2d 721, 730, 412 N.W.2d 139 (Ct. App. 1987).

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment 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