



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

December 18, 2025

To:

Hon. Paul S. Curran
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

David J. Pliner
Electronic Notice

Alecia Kast
Clerk of Circuit Court
Juneau County Justice Center
Electronic Notice

Joseph Zloza
Electronic Notice

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

2025AP105

Joseph Zloza v. Cherry or Cheryl Balberts or Alberts
(L.C. # 2024CV243)

Before Graham, P.J., Nashold, 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).

Joseph Zloza, pro se, appeals a circuit court order dismissing his amended complaint with prejudice and enjoining him from filing any new case without prior leave of the court. Based on 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 summarily affirm.

Zloza filed a complaint in the circuit court that he amended approximately twelve times. His lawsuit was filed against more than forty defendants, including individuals, governmental

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

entities, non-governmental entities, business entities, and more, some of whom were not identified by proper name or with particularity. He alleged that these defendants were liable for, among other things, “[t]orture, war crimes, 1983 claims act, constitutional rights, bill of rights, harassment, all types of Wisconsin, US laws violated, group home negligence, malicious prosecution, [f]alse claims act, FTCA, [and] abuse of power.” He sought \$500 billion in damages and demanded a jury trial.

The circuit court noted Zloza’s “fatal flaw” of failing to file a summons with his complaint as required by WIS. STAT. § 801.02(1). The court dismissed the complaint with prejudice on that basis. While acknowledging that documents filed by pro se plaintiffs are to be liberally construed, *see Amek bin-Rilla v. Israel*, 113 Wis. 2d 514, 520, 335 N.W.2d 384 (1983), the court expressed its concern that Zloza’s original complaint and all subsequent amended complaints failed to fulfill the basic functions of a pleading—including putting the defendants on notice of the plaintiff’s positions and framing the issues to be resolved in the action—and appeared to have been filed for “an improper purpose, such as to harass.” Accordingly, the court imposed the sanction of enjoining Zloza from filing any new case without prior leave of the court under WIS. STAT. § 802.05. This, the court stated, would protect the public’s interest in preventing frivolous litigation while still allowing legitimate litigation.

On appeal, Zloza repeats many of the statements made in his circuit court filings, but he does not explain how the circuit court erred in dismissing his claim or in imposing a filing restriction. Indeed, Zloza’s briefing does not identify the fact of the dismissal or any error that the court made. We affirm on that ground. *See State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646-47, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992) (court of appeals need not consider inadequately developed arguments).

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed.

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

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals