

No. 2020AP1028-J
STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SUPREME COURT

In the Matter of Judicial Disciplinary Proceedings
Against Scott C. Woldt: Wisconsin Judicial Commission v. The Honorable Scott C. Woldt.

September 18, 2020

To:

Joseph M. Troy
jtroy@habush.com

Jeremiah Claude-Benedict Van Hecke
Jeremiah.VanHecke@wicourts.gov

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

Before Kloppenburg, P.J., Hruz, and Seidl, JJ., Judicial Conduct Panel

Briefing in this matter is complete. In his brief, Judge Scott C. Woldt requests the opportunity for oral argument and the opportunity to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. In its reply brief, the Wisconsin Judicial Commission argues that oral argument and the submission of proposed findings and conclusions are not necessary because the facts are undisputed and the complaint, joint stipulation, and briefs are sufficient to inform and assist the panel.

The panel concludes that oral argument and the submission of proposed findings of facts and conclusions of law are not necessary in this matter. We first observe that Judge Woldt did not support his request for oral argument with any reasons why oral argument would assist the panel. In contrast, the Commission makes a compelling explanation of why oral argument is not necessary and would be unremarkable in light of the briefs filed by the parties. Indeed, WIS. STAT. RULE 809.22(2)(b), confirms that oral argument is not necessary when the briefs fully present the issues to be considered and fully develop the theories of each side “so that oral argument would

be of such marginal value that it does not justify the additional expenditure of court time or cost to the litigant.” We also note that Judge Woldt appeared before the Commission on August 16, 2019. Subsequent to that appearance, the parties entered into the joint stipulation of facts which includes Judge Woldt’s admissions to the allegations in the complaint. Finally, as the Commission points out, oral argument before the judicial conduct panel is a rare occurrence when not preceded by a hearing on contested facts or legal issues. Oral argument in this matter would be redundant to the arguments fully developed by the parties’ briefs. In light of the undisputed facts, Judge Woldt’s admissions, and the briefs, oral argument and the submission of proposed findings and conclusions are not necessary. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the panel will take this matter under consideration on the briefs of the parties; Judge Scott C. Woldt’s requests for oral argument and the opportunity to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law are denied.

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Court of Appeals