STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST
ANGELA W. DEBOSE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW

FILED
NOV 09 2026
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
OF WISCONSIN

OFFICE OF LAWYER REGULATION,
Complainant

v.

CASE NO. 2024AP2045-D

ANGELA W. DEBOSE,
Respondent

REFEREE'S ORDER ON RESPONDENT'S MOTIONS FILED OCTOBER 1, 2026 AND OCTOBER 21, 2026

On October 1, 2026, Respondent filed a document titled Unified Motion for Reconsideration of the September 28, 2026 Order[1] and to Vacate All Prior Conflicted Scheduling Configurations (referred to hereinafter as October 1 Motion).

The October 1 Motion requested the following relief: 1) reconsideration of Respondent's motion to stay proceedings pending investigation of Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) Matter 60145 by a Special Investigator; and 2) an extension of the previously-ordered deadline (October 19, 2026) for initiating

[1] This order was dated September 28, 2026, and was filed with the Court on October 2, 2026.

discovery requests. This reconsideration request referenced Respondent's earlier motion filed on September 4, 2026.[2]

The referenced September 4 motion alleged, as grounds for staying the proceeding that OLR Matter 60145 was a complaint filed with OLR accusing Attorney Payette of "bad-faith record contamination."[3]

On October 21, 2026, Respondent filed a document titled Respondent's Emergency Motion for a Protective Order and Temporary Stay of Discovery deadlines as a Protective Measure (referred to hereinafter as October 21 Motion).

This motion seeks reconsideration of her earlier requests related to disqualification of OLR counsel; to the scheduling conference held on September 1, 2026, and to the subsequent scheduling order filed on October 2, 2026.

Respondent has provided no authority, in either motion, for the proposition that a party may disqualify opposing counsel simply by filings an OLR complaint. Although OLR elected to assign successor counsel, Respondent has not shown that any individual OLR attorney (let alone the entire OLR legal staff) should be disqualified. The record in this proceeding does not reflect any improper conduct that would justify disqualification.

Neither the October 1 Motion nor the October 21 Motion contained any controlling authority to support reconsideration of the referee's October 2 order.

---

[2] Respondent also requests amendment of the referee's order filed on October 2, 2026, to correct references to the date of September 2, 2026. Although Respondent's September 4 motion was dated September 2, 2026, the correct filing date was September 4. This discrepancy regarding the date did not affect the substance of the order.

[3] OLR Matter 60145 was not part of the record of this proceeding when the referee considered the September 4 motion. OLR's cover letter to its Notice of Substitution of Counsel implies that Respondent filed the underlying complaint, and Respondent's subsequent October 1 Motion, Appendix C, similarly indicates that Respondent filed this complaint.

OLR, in its Response to Debose's motions, has indicated that OLR does not oppose extending the previously-ordered discovery deadline. Therefore, this deadline is extended to November 20, 2026, to allow both parties ample time to complete initial discovery requests.

For the reasons stated above, Respondent's October 1 Motion and October 21 Motion are hereby denied regarding an indefinite stay of further proceedings; are denied regarding OLR Matter 60145 as grounds to disqualify counsel; and are granted regarding the extension of the deadline for filing initial discovery requests. This discovery deadline is hereby extended to November 20, 2026.

Dated this 9th day of November, 2026.

L. Michael Tobin
Referee
State Bar No. 1010349