



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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT IV**

March 19, 2026

To:

Hon. Patricia A. Barrett  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Ramona A. Golackson  
Petitioner

Carrie Wastlick  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Sauk County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

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

---

2023AP2110

Petitioner v. Ramona A. Golackson (L.C. # 2023CV369)

Before Graham, P.J., Kloppenburg, 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).**

Ramona Golackson, pro se, appeals a harassment injunction order. We conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).<sup>1</sup> We affirm.<sup>2</sup>

An individual (hereafter, “Petitioner”) petitioned the circuit court for a temporary restraining order and a harassment injunction against Golackson. Petitioner alleged that

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner did not file a respondent’s brief. We nevertheless affirm the circuit court based on our review of Golackson’s brief and the appellate record.

Golackson had made calls, left voicemails, and sent text messages for the purpose of harassing Petitioner and Petitioner’s family. The court granted a temporary restraining order to Petitioner. At the injunction hearing, the court heard testimony from Petitioner and Golackson and granted Petitioner’s request for a harassment injunction.<sup>3</sup> In its written order granting the injunction against Golackson, the court found that the record provided reasonable grounds to believe that Golackson engaged in harassment with intent to harass or intimidate Petitioner, as defined in WIS. STAT. § 813.125. Golackson appeals the injunction order.

“We review a circuit court’s decision to grant a harassment injunction for an erroneous exercise of discretion.” *Board of Regents - UW System v. Decker*, 2014 WI 68, ¶19, 355 Wis. 2d 800, 850 N.W.2d 112. We look for reasons to sustain a discretionary ruling. *Id.*, ¶24. In order to issue the injunction, “the circuit court must find ‘reasonable grounds to believe that the respondent has engaged in harassment with intent to harass or intimidate the petitioner.’” *Id.*, ¶20 (citing WIS. STAT. § 813.125(4)(a)3.). We “will uphold the factual findings of the circuit court unless they are clearly erroneous. However, whether reasonable grounds exist to grant the injunction is a question of law that we review de novo.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

Golackson argues here that the circuit court’s factual findings cannot, as a matter of law, provide reasonable grounds for its conclusion that Golackson’s actions constituted harassment. Although Golackson admits to a May 2023 voicemail message and two September 2023 text messages to Petitioner, the latter of which involved swearing, Golackson alleges that Petitioner failed to prove that the incidents between Golackson and Petitioner “rose to the level of

---

<sup>3</sup> The Honorable Michael P. Screnock granted the temporary restraining order. The Honorable Patricia A. Barrett presided over the harassment injunction hearing and granted the injunction.

harassment warranting an injunction under the law” and produced no evidence that Golackson engaged in any conduct prohibited by WIS. STAT. § 813.125(1).

However, Golackson does not cite to the record in support of her assertions. “It is not this court’s responsibility to sift and glean the record in extenso to find facts supporting [a party’s] argument.” *Jensen v. McPherson*, 2004 WI App 145, ¶6 n.4, 275 Wis. 2d 604, 685 N.W.2d 603. This court “may choose not to consider ... arguments that lack proper citation to the record.” *State v. McMorris*, 2007 WI App 231, ¶30, 306 Wis. 2d 79, 742 N.W.2d 322. Moreover, the appellate record does not include the transcript from the harassment injunction hearing at which Golackson and Petitioner both testified.<sup>4</sup> “We are bound by the record as it comes to us.” *Fiumefreddo v. McLean*, 174 Wis. 2d 10, 26, 496 N.W.2d 226 (Ct. App. 1993). We may “assume, in the absence of a transcript, that every fact essential to sustain the [circuit] court’s judgment or order is supported by the record.” *Austin v. Ford Motor Co.*, 86 Wis. 2d 628, 641, 273 N.W.2d 233 (1979).

We assume that every fact essential to sustain the circuit court’s harassment injunction order is supported by the record. Accordingly, we reject Golackson’s argument that, as a matter of law, the court’s factual findings fail to provide reasonable grounds for its conclusion that Golackson’s actions constituted harassment. Accordingly, we affirm.

---

<sup>4</sup> By order dated May 10, 2024, we warned Golackson that when a transcript is not part of the appellate record, we will assume that the transcript supports every fact essential to the circuit court decision to which it relates. By order dated June 26, 2024, we alerted Golackson that once the hearing transcript is filed with the circuit court, it will need to be supplemented to the record on appeal. However, Golackson did not supplement the record on appeal with the hearing transcript.

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*