

Wisconsin Supreme Court

No. _____

~~Court of appeals 20AP840~~

~~St. Croix county Lower court Case number 19CV 0108 Class code 30607 Judge Edward Vlack~~

~~110 East main Street Suit 215~~

~~P. O. Box 1688~~

~~Madison Wisconsin 53701 1688 August 26th, 2021~~

Pat Schottler Petitioner

12:01 PM

sent

V

The department of transportation Secretary Dave Ross
ending

To Clerk of court

A response is requested and required.

Pat Schottler

1479 160th. St.

New Richmond WI 54017

612 – 963 – 5547 leave a messge I do not answer my phone.

I would like to hold a hearing/meeting in the Supreme court hearing room.

To address some issues.

1. Prejudice by the Supreme Court against people who are pro se.
2. the complex case Of Pat Schottler vs. the department of transportation.
3. Inside of the case are numerous issues.

I am the kind of person who when I find out the Supreme Court is prejudice. I take that issue up with the people involved.

At this hearing I will invite the Governor, the attorney General, all the attorneys who have worked on the listed case, of **Pat Schottler vs the department of transportation**. All of the Supreme Court justices all of the court of appeals justices involved in this case. The circuit court judge, the news, and the legislature.

This is an important meeting which needs to be done. The best place for it is the Supreme court hearing room it self. Where I expect the Supreme court judges to come out and hear what I have to say.... IF they don't come, it will amplify what I am saying. When I say the Supreme court is Prejudice.

I have a list of questions I am requesting the Clerk of court of the Supreme court to answer.

Questions

1. When is the last time the Supreme court heard a case by someone Pro se.
2. What kind of sound system does the supreme court have. Can I tie into it with a zip drive on an mp3 file.
3. I bought a Sound bar with 520 watts of power to use in the supreme court hearing room if I can not tie into the system I will bring it as a back up if there are any issues.
4. What kind of video or digital screen do you have. To show all people in attendance. Such as if I put up a flow chart of the laws involved in this case.
5. What is the Supreme Courts Schedule. What dates are open, what times are available. So that I don't overlap on there schedule. Where they will be at the court on that day to attend my hearing.
6. Can people see the hearing over the internet of video of the event. Is there camera's in the court hearing room.

If any one wants to know what the case is about, not the prejudice part, but the actual case It is **Pat Schottler vs. The department of transportation. Court of appeals 20AP840**

I am not requesting the Supreme court hear this case in violation of justice. Opposing Council IS INVITED>.

In other cases General council eludes to a Pro se individual doesn't understand laws. IN this case it is the other way around.

I will cite some examples with out reference.

Attorney General Tony Blythe at one point claimed to Judge Vlack that the department only goes into 343.30 (1q) from 343.16 (5) only after an examination. where he had not reviewed 343.30 (1q)(c) because the court orders the examination in 343.30 (1q)(c) if the person is not going voluntarily.

Attorney General Anthony D. Russomanno. Claims Pat Schottler was ordered to an examination in 343.16 (6) WHERE Pat Schottler points out READ 343.16 (6) it only authorizes examinations in Sub (1) which is 343.16 (1) the court of appeals quoted Anthony D. Russomanno meaning they don't understand the law either.

Judge Vlack claims there was no issue of material fact. 227.42 (1)(d) where Pat Schottler points out Pat was asking Judge Vlack to decide disputes of material fact. (DC 2, PGS 26 and 27). Now to be fair to judge Vlack this issue came up after a motion for reconsideration. So Pat Schottler could not ask Judge Vlack to determine that issue. Because the case had been closed. How ever Pat Schottler after appealing to the court of appeals who were taking six months to determine the case did propose the issue to Judge Vlack in circuit court. where for at this time Judge Vlack has not determined those issues.

This case is very complex. A judge can't cover the issues in one ruling. When Pat Schottler points out an error such as 227.42 (2) in a motion for reconsideration and Judge Vlack makes another issue. Pat

Schottler can not file another motion for reconsideration. The rules of procedure don't fit this case. It is very complex. Because the department did not follow the laws which will be covered in the hearing. the way they are suppose to be handled.

The clear issue. The laws are not being interpreted correctly is. DUE PROCESS OF LAW. Pat Schottler's license was canceled with out due process of law where he is to be confronted in a court of law with the accusations against him. and the officer or persons, who charged him with the crime there claiming Pat Schottler violated. Before taking Pat Schottlers drivers license.

I repeat this case is way to complex even for opposing council. We get into issues of Judicial review. Which have no bearing in the Supreme Court because the Supreme Court has ruled it can hear any case at any time in history. IN this case the circuit court and the court of appeals did not decide the issues to the satisfaction of Pat Schottler. Where for the case is PETITIONED FOR REVIEW. In the Supreme court Filed August 6th, 2021.

Pat Schottler has not had a drivers license in 7 years. Where for if the laws had been followed and the department had ordered a driver safety plan in accordance with 343.30 (1q) that safety plan can not extend beyond one year in 343.30 (1q)(d) Pat Schottler should have had a drivers license six years ago. The department is still refusing to grant it. Where at one point Anthony D. Russomanno claims Pat Schottler can apply under 343.26 (1) at any time. where Pat Schottler points out. HE DID. On March 6th 2019. In the record where for when it was denied because the department claimed Pat Was not eligible Pat Schottler filed for judicial review on March 11th, 2019 five days later.

What you just read: is only a sample of the complexity of this case. When 343.25 (7) is mentioned it then involves approximately 100 statutes, That is to complex of a case for most attorneys who spend most of there lives looking at cases with just one statute. Pat Schottler has been studying these laws longer than most attorneys have spent years in school.

Pat Schottler says... THE LAWS DON'T NEED TO BE CHANGED. They need to be followed by the department. As they were intended and written. that requires explaining and studying.

Pat Schottler has wrote out way more than he needed to in this request to use the Supreme court hearing room to invite the people he wishes to invite. But he wanted to make it clear he is worthy of the cause and this case is truly complex.

Objective to keep the hearing under one hour

Pat Schottler

1479 160th ST.


New Richmond WI 54017

Please respond in writing.

Under **343.25 (7)** exist these statutes. Approximately 100 statutes.

343.32(2)	343.16(1)	343.16(2)	343.16(5)	343.16(3)	343.30(1q)
chapter 349	343.07(4)	49 CFR 383.71	343.265	343.165(4)(d)	346.63(1)
chapter 341	343.07(2)(b)	to 383.135	448.01(6)		346.63(2)
chapter 348	343.07(2)(bm)	346.072	441.16(2)	343.16(4)	940.25
343.085(5)	343.07(2)(d)	343.175(2)	146.82(3)	343.135	940.09
343.07	343.07(2)(e)	343.30(1q)	346.63(1)		343.16(5)(a)
chapter 347	42 CFR 73	343.303	346.63(5)	343.16(6)	343.307(1)
346.44	343.125	343.31	346.63(1m)	343.16(1)	343.10
346.62(2m)	343.04(2)(a)	343.63	346.63(2)		940.09(1)
346.94(22)(c)	343.04(2)(c)	346.655	346.63(6)	343.16(7)	343.307(1)
346.94(22)(d)	343.04(2)(f)	343.16(5)	940.25	includes	51.45(2)(c)
346.63(6)	49 CFR 383.110	343.16(6)(a)	940.09	all of 343.16	51.01(2c)
346.63(2m)	to 383.135	340.01(7m)	343.30(1q)(d)	all of these.	51.45(2)(c)
346.63(7)(a)	343.12(2)(h)	340.01(41m)	15.08(7)		51.42
343.63(5)	115.001(15m)	340.01(8)(a)	20.395(5)(cq)	343.25(7)	46.03(18)(f)
346.70(1)	343.04(1)(d)	340.01(8)(b)	343.40	343.16	345.60
343.18(1)	343.04(1)(e)	343.04(1)	343.30(1q)*	343.32(2)	51.01(2c)
347.41	343.03(3)(a)	343.21(1)(d)			51.45(7)(h)
347.455	343.085	343.21(1)(n)			343.305
346.922		49 CFR 383			343.63(2m)
347.48(2m)					343.305(8)(d)
347.48(b)					
347.48(c)					
347.48(d)					
347.48(4)(am)					
343.30		Also	51.20 (3)	and chapter	227
343.31					
343.16(2)(b)					
343.16(5)					
343.16(6)(a)					

I Pat Schottler certify that this document was mailed by certified or next day delivery mail with tracking numbers. on this day In the United states postal service for delivery by mail with postage pre paid to:



Pat Schottler

August 26th, 2021

Wisconsin Supreme Court
110 East main Street Suit 215
P. O. Box 1688
Madison Wisconsin 53701 – 1688
608 – 266 - 1880

(assistant attorney General department of justice)

Anthony D. Russomanno & others
17 W. Main Street
P. O. Box 7857
Madison WI 53707 – 7857
608 – 267 – 2238

Pat Schottler
1479 160th St.
New Richmond WI 53071

CERTIFIED MAIL



7020 1290 0001 3177 4765

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
NEW RICHMOND, WI
53071
AUG 26, 21
\$9.05
R2304W120792-13



53701



1024

Wisconsin Supreme Court
110 East main Street Suite 215
P.O. Box 1688
Madison Wisconsin 53707-1688

