COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND FILED

November 4, 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. 2026AP462 **Cir. Ct. No. 2004CF1004**

STATE OF WISCONSIN **IN COURT OF APPEALS**
DISTRICT II

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,

V.

KOSLAWANDSKY B. HARRIS,

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Kenosha County: GERAD T. DOUGVILLO, Judge. *Affirmed*.

¶1 GUNDRUM, J.[1] In 2025, appellant Koslawandsky B. Harris began filing in the circuit court what became a series of motions seeking relief in one

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

form or another on his more than 20-year-old conviction, by plea of no contest, on the charge of having sex with a child age 16 or older. The court summarily denied the motions, concluding they lacked merit. Harris appeals. For the following reasons, we affirm.

¶2 As the appellant, Harris bears the burden on appeal 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. He has completely failed even to attempt to demonstrate this to us, and as a result, we are unable to provide him any form of relief.

¶3 Harris's brief fails to comply with several requirements of the Wisconsin Rules of Appellate Procedure. The facts represented throughout Harris'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 Harris's brief does cite ***Strickland v. Washington***, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), he fails to develop a sufficient legal argument to support his claims of error by the circuit court. "We may decline to review issues inadequately briefed," ***State v. Pettit***, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992); *see also* ***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."), and here, we will not abandon our neutrality to attempt to develop arguments for Harris, *see* ***Industrial Risk Insurers v. American Eng'g Testing, Inc.***, 2009 WI App 62, ¶25, 318 Wis. 2d 148, 769 N.W.2d 82. 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." ***Pettit***, 171 Wis. 2d at 647.

¶4 Although Harris is representing himself in this appeal, his 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). Without developed and supported arguments as to errors of the circuit court proceedings, Harris cannot meet his burden to show how the circuit court erred. Because he 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.