



## OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**Supreme Court of Wisconsin**

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WI 53701-1688

TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880

FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640

Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

November 4, 2022

**To:**

Hon. Faye M. Flancher  
Circuit Court Judge  
Racine County Courthouse  
730 Wisconsin Ave.  
Racine, WI 53403

Hon. Mark F. Nielsen  
Circuit Court Judge  
Racine County Courthouse  
730 Wisconsin Avenue  
Racine, WI 53403

Samuel A. Christensen  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Racine County Courthouse  
730 Wisconsin Avenue  
Racine, WI 53403

Patricia J. Hanson  
District Attorney  
730 Wisconsin Avenue  
Racine, WI 53403

Lisa E.F. Kumfer  
Assistant Attorney General  
P.O. Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53707

Melinda A. Swartz  
Law Office of Melinda Swartz LLC  
5215 North Ironwood Road, Ste. 216A  
Milwaukee, WI 53217

You are hereby notified that the Court, by its Clerk and Commissioners, has entered the following order:

---

No. 2019AP2383-CR      State v. Jackson, L.C. #2014CF1721

The court has before it the sixth motion from counsel for defendant-appellant-petitioner, Daimon Von Jackson, for an extension of a briefing deadline; namely, a two-day extension to file a reply brief, from November 7, 2022, to November 9, 2022.

The court has repeatedly warned counsel against making continued extension requests. See August 26, 2022 order (warning that "[t]his is the final extension of time that will be granted to defendant-appellant-petitioner"); September 21, 2022 order (warning that "absolutely no further extensions for defendant-appellant-petitioner will be considered or granted"); October 13, 2022 order (warning that "[w]ith a firm oral argument date of November 29, 2022, there is no time available for additional extensions, so none will be granted"). Nevertheless, counsel now alleges

Page 2

November 4, 2022

No. 2019AP2383-CR

State v. Jackson, L.C. #2014CF1721

that a two-day extension is warranted because her receipt of the State's response brief was delayed by its mailing of the brief to counsel's prior address.

Albeit with some reluctance, the court will grant this sixth extension motion. Counsel is advised in the strongest possible terms that no further extensions will be granted.

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for an extension of time is granted.

---

---

Sheila T. Reiff  
Clerk of Supreme Court