

**COURT OF APPEALS  
DECISION  
DATED AND FILED**

July 13, 1999

Marilyn L. Graves  
Clerk, Court of Appeals  
of Wisconsin

**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 § 808.10 and RULE 809.62, STATS.

**No. 99-0468-CR**

**STATE OF WISCONSIN**

**IN COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT III**

---

**STATE OF WISCONSIN,**

**PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,**

**V.**

**DANIEL SCOTT PETERSON,**

**DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.**

---

APPEAL from a judgment of the circuit court for Door County:  
PETER C. DILTZ, Judge. *Affirmed.*

HOOVER, J. Daniel Peterson appeals his conviction for obstructing an officer, contrary to § 946.41(1), STATS. He asserts that the circuit court erred “directly or indirectly” when it failed to provide findings of facts and conclusions “to warrant any action against the Petitioner,” in violation of the state and federal due process clauses. This court has carefully reviewed Peterson’s

brief and concludes that it fails to advance arguments in a manner susceptible to appellate review. The judgment is therefore affirmed.

Peterson was stopped by a deputy sheriff for operating a vehicle at night without taillights. During the deputy's investigation, Peterson provided a false date of birth<sup>1</sup> and gave him an international driving permit purportedly issued by an agency in Nassau, New Province, Bahamas. This permit contained the same false date of birth. Once the deputy was able to confirm Peterson's correct date of birth, he was able to determine through the Department of Transportation that Peterson's operating privileges were suspended. The deputy similarly ascertained that there was an outstanding arrest warrant from an adjoining county for another false identification incident. Hearing this and other evidence,<sup>2</sup> a jury found Peterson guilty of obstructing an officer.

On appeal, Peterson contends that:

At all times relevant the Respondent has failed to provide any findings of facts and conclusions of law to justify any and all action taken by the purported plaintiff STATE OF WISCONSIN and against the Petitioner directly or indirectly upon the record to justify their individual acts.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Department of Transportation record check came back "no file" for Peterson with the date of birth provided the deputy. This led to a search of the sheriff's department's internal records, which contained Peterson's correct date of birth.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Peterson's certified driving record, marriage certificate and birth certificate were received into evidence to establish his actual date of birth. The trial court also received evidence of another recent incident in which Peterson gave a sheriff's deputy a false name, date of birth and a Nicaraguan driver's license. The court admitted this evidence to show Peterson's intent.

That their acts have no basis in fact or law and is [sic.] accordingly groundless.”<sup>3</sup>

As to his first contention, Peterson seems to imply that the circuit court’s failure to provide findings of fact and conclusions of law deprives the court of jurisdiction. He does not specifically identify those actions that he believes should be the subject of findings of fact and conclusions of law. Peterson supplies no legal authority for the proposition that, in the context of a criminal jury trial utilizing a general verdict, the trial court erred by not making findings and conclusions. Peterson does not identify any prejudice that he suffered as a result of the perceived error. He merely provides citations for the propositions that jurisdiction is necessary for the court to determine a cause and therefore must be proven. He does not relate these axioms to his contention that the trial court erred by failing to make findings of fact and conclusions of law. This court declines to address issues raised on appeal that are inadequately briefed. *See State v. Flynn*, 190 Wis.2d 31, 58, 527 N.W.2d 343, 354 (Ct. App. 1994).

This court deems Peterson’s second argument—no basis in law or facts—to relate to the sufficiency of the evidence. While Peterson provided some minimal, if disassociated, discussion in support of his first contention, he does

---

<sup>3</sup> He also raises two “affirmative defenses:” He is not a “person” as that term is defined in § 990.01(26), STATS., and “he does not reside within the statutorily created, defacto STATE within the meaning of the Wisconsin Statute to wit **990.01(40)** ....” These are tunes to which this court declines to dance. *See State v. Waste Mgmt. of Wis., Inc.*, 81 Wis.2d 555, 564, 261 N.W.2d 147, 151 (1977).

nothing to develop his second assertion. He does not address the infirmity he perceives in the State's case. This court declines to abandon its neutrality in an attempt to develop Peterson's argument for him. *See State v. Gulrud*, 140 Wis.2d 721, 730, 412 N.W.2d 139, 142 (Ct. App. 1987). Moreover, it appears from the evidence received at the trial and recited herein that there was substantial evidence to support the jury's guilty verdict.

Peterson has failed to advance or develop any arguably meritorious contentions. His appeal therefore denied, and the judgment of conviction is affirmed.

*By the Court.*—Judgment affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. RULE 809.23(1)(b)4, STATS.

