



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 IV

October 23, 2025

To:

Hon. Rhonda L. Lanford
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Jeff Okazaki
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dane County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Brock A. Bruehlman
Electronic Notice

Anthony P. Davenport
Wisconsin Department of Health Services
P.O. Box 7850
1 West Wilson Street, Rm. 650
Madison, WI 53707

Andrew J. Wright
3848 Maple Grove Dr., #109
Madison, WI 53719

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

2024AP805

The Bank of New Glarus v. Andrew J. Wright
(L.C. # 2024CV156)

Before Graham, P.J., Blanchard, and Taylor, 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).

Andrew Wright, pro se, appeals a judgment of foreclosure entered by the circuit court. Wright argues on appeal that the circuit court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction. After reviewing 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 summarily affirm.

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

The Bank of New Glarus filed a summons and complaint, seeking to foreclose the mortgage on property owned by Wright in Dane County, Wisconsin. In lieu of filing an answer, Wright filed a motion to dismiss, arguing that the circuit court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction. The bank then moved for judgment on the pleadings. On March 19, 2024, the court held a hearing on the motions. Electronic circuit court docket entries indicate that, at the hearing, the court heard arguments from both parties before denying Wright's motion to dismiss and granting the Bank's motion for judgment on the pleadings. The court entered a judgment of foreclosure against Wright and entered written findings of fact and conclusions of law. Wright appeals.

As a threshold matter, we note that the record lacks the transcript of the motion hearing held by the circuit court on March 19, 2024, on the parties' dispositive motions. It is the appellant's duty to ensure that the record is sufficient to address the issues raised on appeal. *See State Bank of Hartland v. Arndt*, 129 Wis. 2d 411, 423, 385 N.W.2d 219 (Ct. App. 1986). When a hearing transcript pertaining to a decision of the circuit court challenged on appeal is not provided as part of the appellate record, we assume the transcript supports every fact essential to the circuit court's exercise of discretion. *Austin v. Ford Motor Co.*, 86 Wis. 2d 628, 641, 273 N.W.2d 233 (1979).

We turn then to Wright's argument that the circuit court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this case. Article VII, Section 8 of the Wisconsin Constitution provides, in relevant part: "Except as otherwise provided by law, the circuit court shall have original jurisdiction in all matters civil and criminal within this state" The complaint filed in this case alleges that Wright defaulted on a promissory note secured by property owned by Wright in Dane County. Wright fails to provide any applicable legal authority to support his assertion that the circuit

court for Dane County, where the subject property is located, lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this foreclosure action. This court need not consider arguments that are unsupported by adequate factual and legal citations or are otherwise undeveloped. See *Grothe v. Valley Coatings, Inc.*, 2000 WI App 240, ¶6, 239 Wis. 2d 406, 620 N.W.2d 463 (lack of record citations), abrogated on other grounds by *Wiley v. M.M.N. Laufer Fam. 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) (undeveloped legal arguments). We reject as undeveloped Wright's argument that the circuit court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this foreclosure action.

Wright also argues that the circuit court lacked personal jurisdiction over him. Wright's personal jurisdiction argument is contradicted by the record, which contains proof of service establishing that Wright was personally served with the summons and complaint in Dane County. The proof of service was certified and signed by a Dane County deputy sheriff and filed with the circuit court. Wright does not cite to any document in the record contradicting the facts contained in the proof of service. We reject Wright's conclusory argument that the circuit court lacked personal jurisdiction over him.

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment is summarily affirmed under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals