

**COURT OF APPEALS  
DECISION  
DATED AND FILED**

**March 1, 2018**

Sheila T. Reiff  
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. 2017AP2187**

**Cir. Ct. No. 2017SC4160**

**STATE OF WISCONSIN**

**IN COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT IV**

---

**JAMES EDWARD GRANT,**

**PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,**

**V.**

**SARAH ELIZABETH REYES,**

**DEFENDANT-RESPONDENT.**

---

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Dane County:  
STEPHEN E. EHLKE, Judge. *Affirmed.*

¶1 BLANCHARD, J.<sup>1</sup> James Edward Grant, pro se, appeals a circuit court order dismissing in its entirety his small claims action against Sarah

---

<sup>1</sup> This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(a) (2015-16). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version unless otherwise noted.

Elizabeth Reyes. Grant's small claims action stems from an injunction hearing that occurred in Milwaukee County and, borrowing from the words of the circuit court, essentially alleges that Reyes is "slandering him and disrespecting him" through statements in court documents that Reyes filed in the injunction proceeding. Grant's appellate brief is difficult to understand. However, he may mean to argue that the circuit court erred in concluding that this action consists only of "conclusory allegations" and that it fails to state a cause of action.

¶2 Grant's arguments are incoherent and unsupported, either by citations to the record or to pertinent legal authority. Therefore, I reject as undeveloped whatever arguments Grant intends to make. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19 (1)(d) and (e) (setting forth the requirements for briefs); *Grothe v. Valley Coatings, Inc.*, 2000 WI App 240, ¶6, 239 Wis.2d 406, 620 N.W.2d 463 (regarding arguments not supported by citations to the record), *abrogated on other grounds by Wiley v. M.M.N. Laufer Family Ltd. P'ship*, 2011 WI App 158, 338 Wis. 2d 178, 807 N.W.2d 236; *State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (regarding arguments unsupported by legal authority). Even applying the less stringent standards that this court typically extends to unrepresented litigants in the interests of justice, I would have to create from whole cloth whatever cognizable arguments, if any, Grant may intend to offer that would challenge any specific decision made by the circuit court in this action.

¶3 Moreover, as best I can discern, Grant's intended arguments appear to be wholly without merit. As the circuit court recognized, Grant's claims all

appear to arise out of his discontent with the injunction proceedings in Milwaukee County and are not appropriately raised in this separate small claims action.<sup>2</sup>

*By the Court.*—Order affirmed.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Reyes did not file a response brief on appeal. However, I conclude that this appeal may be decided based solely on Grant's brief and the record.

