

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND FILED**

September 9, 2026

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See WIS. STAT. § 808.10 and RULE 809.62.

**Appeal No. 2026AP513
STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Cir. Ct. No. 2024SC2048

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT II**

VELOCITY INVESTMENTS, LLC,

PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,

V.

JAYCEE HASS,

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Winnebago County:
SCOTT C. WOLDT, Judge. *Affirmed.*

¶1 GUNDRUM, J.¹ Jaycee Hass, pro se, appeals from a circuit court order denying her motion to vacate the court's order denying her motion for

¹ This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(a) (2023-24). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

reconsideration and to reopen a judgment entered by the court commissioner. For the following reasons, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

¶2 On July 18, 2024, Velocity Investments, LLC filed a complaint alleging that on November 9, 2021, Hass entered into a promissory note, which was sold and assigned to Velocity, by which she agreed to pay \$2,200. The complaint further alleged that Hass failed to pay as required by the note and that the balance due at the time of filing of the complaint was \$2,518.30. Attached to the complaint was a copy of the note as well as a document purportedly reflecting the transaction history.

¶3 On August 7, 2024, the circuit court entered a default judgment and, on September 4, 2024, Hass filed a motion to reopen the default judgment. After a hearing on the motion, the court granted Hass's motion, reopened the case, vacated the default judgment, and scheduled a court trial for January 13, 2025. The court rescheduled the trial to February 3rd, but after respondent's counsel's requested adjournment, the court again rescheduled it for March 31st. The court informed Hass by telephone that the February 3rd trial had been rescheduled and later mailed notice of the new hearing date.

¶4 Because Hass did not appear on March 31st, the circuit court entered a default judgment. Hass then filed a motion to reopen. The court scheduled a hearing on the motion for May 15th, and Hass filed a motion to reschedule, which the court granted, rescheduling the hearing to June 5th. Because respondent's counsel had a conflict with the new hearing date, the court rescheduled the motion hearing to July 3rd. Hass again did not appear for the hearing, and therefore the court denied her motion to reopen the judgment, stating, "This is the third motion

to reopen [Hass] has filed in this case after failing to appear. The Notice of Hearing for the date [Hass] most recently failed to attend was mailed to the parties one month prior to the hearing.”

¶5 Hass filed another motion to reopen, which the circuit court denied on August 12th. Then, on September 22nd, Hass filed a motion to enlarge the time to file an appeal, which the court denied. Thereafter, Hass filed a “Motion for Reconsideration and Reopening of Order Denying Motion to Enlarge Time to File Notice of Appeal,” which the court denied. (Formatting altered.) Finally, on December 22nd, Hass filed a “Motion to Vacate Denial Order and to Reopen Judgment for Lack of Notice and Due Process Violation,” which the court denied. (Formatting altered.) Hass appeals.

DISCUSSION

¶6 On appeal, Hass contends “the circuit court violated due process by proceeding without notice,” “erroneously exercised its discretion under WIS. STAT. [RULE] 806.07,” and “the interests of justice require reopening the case.” We must affirm.

¶7 Significantly, an appellant, like Hass, bears the burden of demonstrating that the circuit court erred. See **Gaethke v. Pozder**, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381. To begin, Hass’s brief fails to comply with several requirements of the Wisconsin Rules of Appellate Procedure. The facts represented throughout Hass’s brief-in-chief lack support from citations to the record, as required by WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(d)-(e). See **Madely v. RadioShack Corp.**, 2007 WI App 244, ¶14 n.7, 306 Wis. 2d 312, 742 N.W.2d 559 (“[W]e have no duty to scour the record to review arguments unaccompanied by adequate record citations.”). And while Hass’s brief cites some legal authorities and

statutes, she fails to apply the facts of this case to those authorities and fails to develop a sufficient legal argument to support her claims of error by the circuit court. None of Hass’s issues are anywhere near sufficiently developed such that we could rule in her favor. We are not responsible for developing a party’s arguments, and we are not required to address arguments that are insufficiently developed. ***Doe 1 v. Madison Metro. Sch. Dist.***, 2022 WI 65, ¶35, 403 Wis. 2d 369, 976 N.W.2d 584 (stating that appellate courts “do not step out of [their] neutral role to develop or construct arguments for parties” (citation omitted)); ***Clean Wis., Inc. v. PSC***, 2005 WI 93, ¶180 n.40, 282 Wis. 2d 250, 700 N.W.2d 768 (“We will not address undeveloped arguments.”); ***State v. Pettit***, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (“We may decline to review issues inadequately briefed.”). We are a “fast-paced, high-volume court” and, as such, “[t]here are limits beyond which we cannot go in overlooking these kinds of failings.” ***Id.*** at 647. Although Hass is representing herself in this appeal, her brief must still comply with “relevant rules of procedural and substantive law.” See ***Waushara County v. Graf***, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992) (citation omitted).

¶8 Without developed and supported arguments as to errors of the proceedings in the circuit court, Hass is unable to meet her burden to demonstrate how the court erred. Because she fails to meet that burden, we affirm.

By the Court.—Order affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(1)(b)4.

