FILED
10-22-2026
CLERK OF WISCONSIN
SUPREME COURT

No. 2026AP1772-J
STATE OF WISCONSIN IN THE SUPREME COURT

In the Matter of Judicial Disciplinary Proceedings Against the Honorable Scott C. Woldt:

WISCONSIN JUDICIAL COMMISSION,
Complainant,

v.

HONORABLE SCOTT C. WOLDT,
Respondent.

October 22, 2026

To:

Jeremiah Claude-Benedict Van Hecke
Judicial Commission
110 E. Main Street, Suite 700
Madison, WI 53703

Terry E. Johnson
von Briesen & Roper, S.C.
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1000
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4409

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

Before Nashold, P.J., Gill, and Geenen, JJ., Judicial Conduct Panel.

The Honorable Scott C. Woldt filed a motion for a more definite statement on September 16, 2026, asserting that the Judicial Commission's complaint against him does not provide the necessary clarity and specificity for Judge Woldt to meaningfully respond to the allegations therein. In particular, Judge Woldt requests that the Commission be ordered to identify the individuals referred to in the complaint by their full names rather than their initials and to identify the particular conduct alleged to constitute each alleged violation of the Supreme Court Rules governing judicial conduct. Having considered Judge Woldt's motion, the

Commission's response to the motion, and Judge Woldt's reply in support of the motion, we conclude that the complaint satisfies the requirements of notice pleading and we deny the motion.

Specifically, we are not persuaded that the factual and legal allegations in the complaint—which include the exact dates, locations, and transcriptions of comments Judge Woldt is alleged to have made, the initials of the individuals involved, and the specific violations alleged—are so vague and ambiguous that Judge Woldt "cannot reasonably be required to frame a responsive pleading." *See* WIS. STAT. § 802.06(5) (2023-24). As this court has said, "'[f]air notice' of the claim is all that is required of a pleading." ***Hertlein v. Huchthausen***, 133 Wis. 2d 67, 72, 393 N.W.2d 299 (Ct. App. 1986). Determining additional facts and further defining the legal theories are among the functions that were "shifted to discovery and pretrial motion practice" when our supreme court adopted notice pleading, based on the federal rules of civil procedure, in 1976. ***Id.***

Next, in the interest of efficiently and promptly resolving this matter, we set forth below the deadline for answering the complaint and the date for a scheduling conference. The scheduling conference will be held via videoconference, and the parties will be provided with videoconference connection information by separate communication several days prior to the conference.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for a more definite statement is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Honorable Scott C. Woldt shall serve and file an answer to the complaint by November 12, 2026.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Judicial Conduct Panel will conduct a scheduling conference on December 1, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., by videoconference.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals