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

November 18, 2026

To:

Hon. Gerad T. Dougvillo
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Rebecca Matoska-Mentink
Clerk of Circuit Court
Kenosha County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Nikia Marie Brantley
Electronic Notice

Cleo Marie Stubblefield
5031 24th Avenue
Kenosha, WI 53140

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

2025AP2164 Cleo Marie Stubblefield v. Nikia Marie Brantley
(L.C. #2017FA569)

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

Nikia Marie Brantley appeals pro se from a circuit court order continuing grandparent visitation as previously ordered. Brantley claims the court erred: (1) in denying her the right to cross-examine Cleo Marie Stubblefield (the great-grandmother) at the hearing; (2) in excluding evidence Brantley offered to show prior child abuse allegations were false; and (3) because the order infringed on her constitutional parental rights. 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] We affirm.

Brantley filed a brief-in-chief that does not adequately develop her arguments, fails to cite to any legal authority, and fails to cite to the Record. There was no Response brief filed. We have reviewed the Record, including the hearing where Brantley asked the circuit court to eliminate grandparent visitation altogether. Brantley and Stubblefield testified at the hearing. The guardian ad litem (GAL) for the child recommended that the circuit court deny Brantley's petition to terminate grandparent visitation. The GAL told the court that the child wants the grandparent visitation to continue, and the GAL did not see any evidence presented that proved a substantial change in circumstances warranting termination of visitation. The court denied Brantley's request, explaining to her that even if it "accepts all of your statements at face value, [there] is not a basis for you to defy the prior court order [requiring grandparent visitation]. It's not a basis for you to withhold visitation, and it's certainly not a basis to modify the order going forward."

Even absent a Response brief, as the Appellant, Brantley bears the burden to demonstrate how the circuit court erred. *See* ***Gaethke v. Pozder***, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381. She has failed to meet that burden. While we recognize that Brantley is pro se, she must still abide by the same rules as attorneys. *See* ***Waushara County v. Graf***, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992). Brantley's brief fails to cite to the Record (except for a single general reference to the hearing transcript) and also fails to support her argument with citation to

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

legal authority, both of which our appellate rules require. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(e). In addition to failing to comply with the rules of appellate procedure, Brantley's brief fails to develop any arguments explaining how or why the circuit court erred and she also fails to provide a single legal citation. "We will not address undeveloped arguments." *See* ***Clean Wis., Inc. v. PSC***, 2005 WI 93, ¶180 n.40, 282 Wis. 2d 250, 700 N.W.2d 768. An appellate court cannot properly "serve as both advocate and judge[,]" *see* ***State v. Pettit***, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 647, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992), and thus, it is inappropriate for us to "abandon our neutrality to develop arguments" for Brantley, *see* ***Industrial Risk Insurers v. American Engineering Testing, Inc.***, 2009 WI App 62, ¶25, 318 Wis. 2d 148, 769 N.W.2d 82.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court 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