



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

October 6, 2026

To:

Hon. Reyna I. Morales
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

Cudahy Restoration Foundation LLC
Electronic Notice

Gregory Jackson
2841 N. 45th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53210

Latrivionna Lane
2841 N. 45th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53210

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

2024AP1716

Cudahy Restoration Foundation LLC v. Gregory Jackson
(L.C. # 2023SC17333)

Before Donald, C.J.¹

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).

Gregory Jackson and Latrivionna Lane (collectively, Jackson) appeal from the order that ordered that they owed the Respondent, Cudahy Restoration Foundation LLC (hereinafter, Cudahy) the balance of \$9,393.78. Based on our review of the briefs and the record, we conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1). For the following reasons, we reject Jackson's arguments and affirm.

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.

This appeal arises from an eviction action initiated by Cudahy against its tenant Jackson in July 2023. Cudahy sought restitution of the premises based on nonpayment of rent and breach of the rental agreement. Cudahy also sought damages in the form of past due rent, late fees, utilities, waste, and holdover damages. At the initial return date on July 24, 2023, a commissioner granted the first cause of action and issued a writ of restitution.

A contested evidentiary hearing was held on the issue of rent and damages in March 2024, wherein the commissioner entered an oral decision in favor of Jackson and dismissed Cudahy's claims. Cudahy subsequently filed a demand for trial, which was held on August 15, 2024. There, the circuit court heard testimony from multiple witnesses and ultimately found in favor of Cudahy, granting its demand for damages in the amount of \$9,185.78, plus costs. Jackson now appeals.

Ultimately, we reject Jackson's arguments due to deficiencies in his appellate submissions. The transcript for the court trial was not requested nor included in the appellate record. "We are bound by the record as it comes to us." *Fiumefreddo v. McClean*, 174 Wis. 2d 10, 26, 496 N.W.2d 226 (Ct. App. 1993). "It is the appellant's responsibility to ensure completion of the appellate record and 'when an appellate record is incomplete in connection with an issue raised by the appellant, we must assume that the missing material supports the [circuit] court's ruling.'" *Gaethke v. Pozder*, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381 (citation omitted). Without the hearing transcript, Jackson cannot provide this court with a statement of facts with "appropriate references to the record" and is unable to support his arguments with citations to the "parts of the record relied on[.]" See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(d), (e).

Jackson presents no legal argument to support his appeal, nor does he provide any citations to the record or applicable law. Instead, Jackson merely restates his version of the facts. While pro se litigants are generally given some leeway in recognizing that they may not be familiar with the procedural rules and substantive law that governs their appeal, that leeway is not unlimited. *State ex rel. Wren v. Richardson*, 2019 WI 110, ¶25, 389 Wis. 2d 516, 936 N.W.2d 587. “[W]e do not impute to pro se litigants the best argument they could have, but did not, make.” *Id.* Thus, Jackson cannot meet his burden of demonstrating that the circuit court erred. See *Gaethke*, 376 Wis. 2d 448, ¶36 (stating that it is the appellant’s burden to demonstrate that the circuit court erred). Accordingly, we summarily affirm.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the order 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