



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

March 19, 2025

To:

Hon. Rebecca L. Persick
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Chris Koenig
Clerk of Circuit Court
Sheboygan County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Petitioner

Quentin Louis Rogers #119970
Sheboygan County Detention Center
2923 S. 31st St.
Sheboygan, WI 53081

Sheboygan County Detention Center
2923 S. 31st St.
Sheboygan, WI 53081

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

2024AP75

Petitioner v. Quentin Louis Rogers (L.C. #2023CV650)

Before Gundrum, P.J., Neubauer and Grogan, 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).

Quentin Louis Rogers appeals pro se from an order of the circuit court. 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

On appeal, the appellant, here Rogers, bears the burden of showing that the circuit court erred. *See Gaethke v. Pozder*, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381. Also

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version unless otherwise noted.

on appeal, we do not consider insufficiently developed arguments. *See State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (“We may decline to review issues inadequately briefed.”). Thus, where an appellant fails to sufficiently develop any arguments to show that the court erred, he cannot prevail. That is the circumstance here.

Rogers raises multiple issues on appeal—that the circuit court violated his due process rights, erred in not exercising its “inherent authority” to appoint counsel for Rogers, failed to hold a de novo hearing within thirty days after Rogers filed a motion requesting such a hearing following the court commissioner’s issuance of a temporary restraining order (TRO), and that the court commissioner erred in issuing the TRO because there was insufficient evidence in support of it. Unfortunately, not only does Rogers fail to cite to portions of the record supporting his position on these issues, in violation of WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(e), he completely fails to develop legal arguments to demonstrate that the court erred. Although Rogers is representing himself in this appeal, his brief must still comply with these requirements. *See Waushara County v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992). It is not our responsibility to develop arguments for a party, and we are not required to address arguments that are undeveloped or not supported by citations to the record. *Doe v. Madison Metro. Sch. Dist.*, 2022 WI 65, ¶35, 403 Wis. 2d 369, 976 N.W.2d 584 (stating that appellate courts “do not step out of [their] neutral role to develop or construct arguments for parties” (citation omitted)); *Madely v. RadioShack Corp.*, 2007 WI App 244, ¶14 n.7, 306 Wis. 2d 312, 742 N.W.2d 559 (stating that “we have no duty to scour the record to review arguments unaccompanied by adequate record citations”). As a result, Rogers failed to satisfy his appellate burden and his appeal fails. Rogers’ challenge to the court commissioner’s grant of a TRO further fails because a ruling of a court commissioner may not be directly appealed to this court. *See State v.*

Trongeau, 135 Wis. 2d 188, 192-94, 400 N.W.2d 12 (Ct. App. 1986) (indicating the court of appeals is without jurisdiction to review a court commissioner's orders and that authority for such review is with the circuit court).

Therefore,

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