



OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
**Supreme Court of Wisconsin**

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WI 53701-1688

TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880

FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640

Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

FILED

09-15-2025

CLERK OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

September 15, 2025

**To:**

Hon. Gerad T. Dougville  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

Rebecca Matoska-Mentink  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Kenosha County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Glenn H. Hale 211455  
Stanley Correctional Inst.  
100 Corrections Dr.  
Stanley, WI 54768

You are hereby notified that the Court, by its Clerk and Commissioners, has entered the following order:

---

---

No. 2025XX1670-CR      State v. Hale, L.C.#2002CF10

By order of September 9, 2025, this court dismissed as untimely an August 18, 2025 request from Glenn H. Hale for this court to “revisit its previous decision” in State v. Hale, 2005 WI 7, 277 Wis. 2d 593, 691 N.W.2d 637. See Wis. Stat. (Rule) § 809.64 (“A party may seek reconsideration of the judgment or opinion of the supreme court by filing a motion under s. 809.14 for reconsideration within 20 days after the date of the decision of the supreme court.”)

That same day (September 9, 2025), the clerk of this court received a filing from Mr. Hale objecting to the State’s failure to file a formal response to his August 18, 2025 filing. Mr. Hale asks this court “to issue an order requiring the State of Wisconsin to show cause as to why the petitioner’s petition for review should not be granted.”

IT IS ORDERED that Mr. Hale’s September 9, 2025 filing is dismissed. Mr. Hale’s August 18, 2025 filing cannot be construed as a petition for review, as such petitions must concern an adverse decision of the court of appeals, and must be filed within 30 days of the date of that decision. See Wis. Stat. §§ 808.10(1), 809.62(1m)(a)1. By contrast, Mr. Hale’s August 18, 2025 filing asked this court to revisit its own decision from 20 years earlier. As such, this request amounted to an untimely motion for reconsideration, as explained in our September 9, 2025 order dismissing it. The matter is closed; no substantive response from the State is necessary.

---

---

Samuel A. Christensen  
Clerk of Supreme Court