FILED

OCT 01 2026

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
OF WISCONSIN

STATE OF WISCONSIN IN THE SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST
ANGELA W. DEBOSE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW

OFFICE OF LAWYER REGULATION,
Complainant

v. CASE NO. 2024AP2045-D

ANGELA W. DEBOSE,
Respondent

REFEREE'S ORDER ON RESPONDENT'S MOTION FILED SEPTEMBER 4, 2026

A continued telephonic scheduling conference was held in this matter on September 1, 2026. Participants in the conference were Attorney John Payette, Attorney for Complainant, the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR); Attorney Angela DeBose, Respondent; and the undersigned referee.

Following this scheduling conference, the Referee prepared a written order providing that on or before October 19, 2026, all discovery requests should be submitted, with the exception of any requests for depositions.

On September 4, 2026, Respondent filed a document titled Respondent's Immediate Written Objections To The September 1, 2026 Scheduling Conference And Motion To Stay Proceedings Or Disqualify Complainant's

Counsel Due To Active Conflict Of Interest (referred to hereinafter as September 4 Motion).

The September 2 Motion requested the following relief: 1) Disqualification of Attorney Payette as counsel for OLR; and 2) A stay of proceedings pending investigation of OLR Matter 60145 by a Special Investigator. The September 2 Motion alleges that OLR Matter 60145 relates to a complaint filed with OLR that accuses Attorney Payette of "bad-faith record contamination."[1]

On September 16, 2026, this Court issued an order denying the September 4 Motion, "to the extent the motion seeks relief from this court."

On September 17, 2026, OLR filed a Notice of Substitution of Counsel, designating Francis Sullivan as successor counsel to Attorney Payette.

Because of OLR's designation of new counsel, Respondent's request to disqualify Attorney Payette is moot. Her request to stay proceedings pending investigation of Attorney Payette is similarly moot.

The September 4 Motion also includes allegations, unsupported by authority, of impropriety in the conduct of the scheduling conference held on September 1, 2026. The alleged or implied improprieties are 1) failure to consider Respondent's "Special Appearance"; 2) failure to have the scheduling conference transcribed; and 3) forcing her into fast-track pro se litigation.

None of these alleged improprieties have merit.

1. The scheduling hearing complied with Supreme Court Rule (SCR) 22.15. The referee made no finding that Respondent's participation in the

[1] OLR Matter 60145 is not part of the record of this proceeding. OLR's cover letter to its Notice of Substitution of Counsel implies that Respondent filed the underlying complaint. Respondent's September 4 Motion does not explain or document the allegation of bad-faith record contamination," and the referee is unaware of any improper submission or filing by OLR in this proceeding.

scheduling conference waived any jurisdictional objection that she may have to the proceeding.[2]

2. SCR 22.15 does not require transcription of the telephonic scheduling conference. *See also* SCR 22.16 (verbatim records in proceeding before referee per chapter 71) and 71.01(2)(c) (exception for "matters related to scheduling").

3. There is no final hearing date set, and the only timeline decided during the scheduling conference was the initiation of discovery requests by October 19, 2026. There is no merit to Respondent's complaint that the proceedings are unduly expedited.

Therefore, the request to stay proceedings is denied; the objections to the scheduling conference are denied; and the request to disqualify Attorney Payette is moot in light of OLR's Notice of Substitution of Counsel.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2026.

L. Michael Tobin
Referee
State Bar No. 1010349

[2] Given Respondent's participation in the proceedings to date, including several filings seeking relief from the referee and/or the Court, it is unclear on what basis she could object to personal jurisdiction.