



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**

April 16, 2026

To:

Hon. Theresa A. Beck  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Kathilynne Grotelueschen  
Electronic Notice

Jennifer L. Weber  
Register in Probate  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Jordan Lippert  
Electronic Notice

G. A. K.

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

---

2025AP2862-NM

Jefferson County v. G.A.K. (L.C. # 2022ME63)

Before Taylor, J.<sup>1</sup>

**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).**

Counsel for G.A.K. has filed a no-merit report concluding that there is no arguable basis for challenging orders extending G.A.K.'s involuntary commitment and authorizing involuntary medication and treatment pursuant to WIS. STAT. ch. 51. The no-merit report addresses the sufficiency of the evidence to support the order for the extension of involuntary commitment, as well as the sufficiency of the evidence to support the circuit court's determination that G.A.K. is not competent to refuse psychotropic medication or treatment. A copy of the report was sent to

---

<sup>1</sup> This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(d) (2023-24). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

G.A.K., and he was informed of his right to file a response. G.A.K. has not filed a response. Upon an independent review of the record as mandated by WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), this court summarily affirms the orders because there are no issues that would have arguable merit for appeal. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

On February 5, 2025, Jefferson County filed a petition to extend G.A.K.'s involuntary commitment and treatment orders. On February 26, 2025, the court held a hearing on the petition. At the hearing, the County elicited testimony from Dr. Sandra Groenewold, a psychiatrist who met with G.A.K. multiple times and reviewed his medical records. Groenewold testified that G.A.K. suffers from mental illness, namely unspecified mood disorder and severe alcohol abuse disorder, that grossly impairs his judgment, behavior, capability to recognize reality, and the ability to meet the daily needs of life. She further testified that when G.A.K. discontinues his psychotropic medication, as he did just a few weeks before the hearing, he becomes very depressed and suicidal and stops eating and drinking. She also testified that she explained the advantages and disadvantages of the medication to G.A.K., but that in her opinion, G.A.K. is unable to apply that information.

G.A.K. also testified. He agreed that he had been “diagnosed by numerous psychiatrists to have a mood disorder,” but suggested that he did not need any medications other than possibly antidepressants and medication to treat his Hashimoto’s disease. He testified that his longest hunger strike lasted fifteen days and that he thought he would not do it again because it was not helping him. He also believed that he would not refuse psychotropic medication if it were to treat depression.

The circuit court determined that the County had established grounds for involuntary commitment and involuntary medication. After recounting the testimony of the two witnesses,

the court found that G.A.K. was mentally ill and dangerous to himself, as shown by his history of hunger strikes and hospitalizations and by his recent decision to stop taking psychotropic medication. The court also found that medication would have a therapeutic value and that, due to his mental illness, G.A.K. was incapable of applying an understanding of the advantages, disadvantages, and alternatives to his condition in order to make an informed choice about psychotropic medication. The court entered orders extending G.A.K.'s involuntary commitment and involuntary medication and treatment for one year.

This court agrees with counsel that there would be no arguable merit to challenging the sufficiency of the evidence to support extension of the commitment order. To obtain an order extending G.A.K.'s commitment, the County had the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that (1) G.A.K. is mentally ill, (2) he is a proper subject for treatment, and (3) he is dangerous to himself or others. *See* WIS. STAT. § 51.20(13)(e), (1)(a); *Langlade County v. D.J.W.*, 2020 WI 41, ¶23, 391 Wis. 2d 231, 942 N.W.2d 277. As discussed above, the testimony at the final hearing supported the circuit court's findings with respect to all of these requirements, as does Groenewold's report, which was admitted into evidence, and the medical records referred to therein. Specifically, the court found that G.A.K. presented a danger to himself under § 51.20(1)(a)2.a., showing a "substantial probability of physical harm to himself ... [by] recent threats of or attempts at suicide or serious bodily harm." The court cited G.A.K.'s recent refusal to take psychotropic medication to treat his mental illness. This evidence also supported the court's finding that G.A.K. presented a danger to himself under § 51.20(1)(a)2.d., showing a "substantial probability exists that death, serious physical injury, serious physical debilitation, or serious physical disease will imminently ensue unless [he] receives prompt and adequate treatment."

This court also agrees with counsel that there would be no arguable merit to challenging the sufficiency of the evidence to support the order authorizing involuntary medication and treatment. The County had the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that G.A.K. was incompetent to refuse medication. *See Outagamie County v. Melanie L.*, 2013 WI 67, ¶37, 349 Wis. 2d 148, 833 N.W.2d 607; WIS. STAT. § 51.20(13)(e). To meet that burden, the County was required to show that the advantages and disadvantages of, and alternatives to, accepting the particular medication or treatment had been explained to G.A.K. and that he was either (1) incapable of expressing an understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of, and the alternatives to, the medication; or (2) substantially incapable of applying an understanding of the advantages, disadvantages, and alternatives due to his mental illness in order to make an informed choice. *See* WIS. STAT. § 51.61(1)(g)4.; *Melanie L.*, 349 Wis. 2d 148, ¶¶53, 67. The circuit court made findings that all of these requirements had been met by clear and convincing evidence, and the record supports the findings.

In addition to the issues discussed above, this court has independently reviewed the record and concluded that there are no arguably meritorious issues for appeal.

IT IS ORDERED that the orders are summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathilynne Grotelueschen is relieved of further representing G.A.K. in this matter. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32(3).

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

---

*Samuel A. Christensen*  
*Clerk of Court of Appeals*