



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 I

May 20, 2025

To:

Hon. Michael J. Hanrahan
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Trevianna Grady

Petitioner

Anna Hodges
Clerk of Circuit Court
Milwaukee County Appeals Processing
Division
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP1299

Petitioner v. Trevianna Grady (L.C. # 2024CV3618)

Before Donald, P.J., Geenen, and Colón, 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).

Petitioner, pro se, appeals the circuit court's order denying her request for an injunction against Trevianna Grady. The Petitioner's brief raises a variety of convoluted arguments and makes a series of unsupported, conclusory assertions which all effectively contend that the circuit court erred when it concluded that the Petitioner failed to meet the burden of proof for a harassment injunction and entered its order denying the harassment injunction. Based upon a

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.

BACKGROUND

The Petitioner filed a petition for a temporary restraining order and petition and motion for an injunction hearing against Grady. The Petitioner alleged that Grady harassed her in various ways. After conducting a hearing on the petition, a court commissioner denied the Petitioner's request for relief and dismissed the case. The Petitioner then filed a motion for a de novo hearing.

The circuit court conducted the de novo hearing and, after taking the testimony of the Petitioner and Grady, found that the Petitioner failed to meet her burden of proof for a harassment injunction and therefore denied the petition and dismissed the case. The Petitioner appeals.

DISCUSSION

Governed by WIS. STAT. § 813.125, courts have the power to issue harassment restraining orders and injunctions when the statutory criteria are met. We review the circuit court's decision for an erroneous exercise of discretion. *Board of Regents-UW Sys. v. Decker*, 2014 WI 68, ¶19, 355 Wis. 2d 800, 850 N.W.2d 112. We will affirm the circuit court's factual findings unless they are clearly erroneous, *id.*, ¶20, and as the appellant, the Petitioner bears the burden of showing

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

that the circuit court erred, *see Gaethke v. Pozder*, 2017 WI App 38, ¶36, 376 Wis. 2d 448, 899 N.W.2d 381.

In her brief, the Petitioner lists several ways she believes that the circuit court erred, including, among other things, that it relied only on information put forth by Grady and ignored the Petitioner’s pleadings and evidence, that it “punished” the Petitioner for not disclosing her full name, and that it created “new rules” specifically for the Petitioner. While the Petitioner included a statement of various facts, it is not clear which are relevant to her argument, and none contain citations to the circuit court record. The Petitioner does not identify how the facts and circuit court credibility findings with which she takes issue are relevant to or demonstrate that the circuit court erred when it determined that she failed to meet the burden of proof. An appellant must sufficiently develop their arguments for this court’s consideration. While this court needs to consider only an appellant’s well developed arguments, *see Barakat v. DHSS*, 191 Wis. 2d 769, 786, 530 N.W.2d 392 (Ct. App. 1995), there is a more fundamental problem with the Petitioner’s appeal: the record is incomplete because the transcript is incomplete.

It is the appellant’s “responsibility to ensure completion of the appellate record and ‘when an appellate record is incomplete in connection with an issue raised by the appellant, we must assume that the missing material supports the trial court’s ruling.’” *State v. McAttee*, 2001 WI App 262, ¶5 n.1, 248 Wis. 2d 865, 637 N.W.2d 774 (citation omitted). The Petitioner did not order and include the complete transcript of the circuit court hearing in the record. The transcript provided is only a portion of the full transcript, and omits the Petitioner’s testimony in its entirety, as well as the court’s ruling; it includes only Grady’s testimony. If a transcript from a proceeding is missing from the appellate record, the appellate court assumes that the missing transcript would support any decision that the circuit court made during that proceeding.

Fiumefreddo v. McLean, 174 Wis. 2d 10, 27, 496 N.W.2d 226 (Ct. App. 1993). We assume so here and, on that ground, affirm the circuit court's order denying Petitioner's request for a restraining order.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the order 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