



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**

May 7, 2026

To:

Hon. Jacob B. Frost  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Teal Boarman  
Electronic Notice

Jeff Okazaki  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Dane County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Jared Gregory Molner  
Electronic Notice

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

---

2025AP17

Teal Boarman v. Jared Gregory Molner (L.C. # 2022CV16)

Before Blanchard, Nashold, 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).**

Jared Molner appeals a judgment partitioning real estate. 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).<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

Plaintiff Teal Boarman commenced this action seeking to void a quitclaim deed that she had signed granting a one-half interest in real property to Molner. The circuit court granted a judgment of partition and awarded the full property to Boarman. Molner appeals.

---

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

Molner’s brief expresses numerous grounds for dissatisfaction with the circuit court proceedings in this matter. The brief fails, however, to develop coherent arguments that apply relevant legal authority to the facts of record, and instead relies largely upon conclusory assertions. “A party must do more than simply toss a bunch of concepts into the air with the hope that either the trial court or the opposing party will arrange them into viable and fact-supported legal theories.” *State v. Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d 328, 337, 600 N.W.2d 39 (Ct. App. 1999). Consequently, 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).

Here, the appellant has failed to develop his arguments legally or to support them factually. As to law, the brief cites none, other than to attempt to incorporate by reference the federal and Wisconsin constitution and statutes. The brief fails to discuss any law related to partition. As to facts, the brief contains some citations to the record, but most factual statements in it are made without citation, in a case that appears to be highly fact-dependent. Therefore, we affirm the circuit court on this basis.

While we make some allowances for the failings of parties who, as here, are not represented by counsel, “[w]e cannot serve as both advocate and judge,” *Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d at 647, and will not scour the record to develop viable, fact-supported legal theories on the appellant’s behalf, *Jackson*, 229 Wis. 2d at 337.

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment appealed from is summarily affirmed under 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*