



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

FILED
02-15-2024
CLERK OF WISCONSIN
SUPREME COURT

February 15, 2024

To:

Hon. Michael H. Bloom
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Arthur G. Jaros Jr.
Electronic Notice

Brenda Behrle
Clerk of Circuit Court
Oneida County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Lisa M. Lawless
Electronic Notice

Michael D. Dean
Electronic Notice

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

No. 2022AP1069

Eagle Cove Camp & Conference Center v. Oneida County Board of Adjustment, L.C.# 2013CV345

The filings before this court include: (1) a January 5, 2024 “Petition of Arthur G. Jaros, Jr. For Review”; and (2) a February 8, 2024 “Motion of Michael D. Dean to Withdraw as Counsel of Record.” These documents raise several concerns, as explained below.

The plaintiffs-appellants in this case are Eagle Cove Camp & Conference Center, Inc., Arthur G. Jaros, Jr., Wesley A. Jaros, and Randall S. Jaros. Arthur, Wesley, and Randall Jaros are brothers and also serve as sole members of the governing board of Eagle Cove Camp & Conference Center, Inc.

Arthur Jaros is an attorney licensed in the state of Illinois. He is not licensed to practice law in Wisconsin. Starting in November 2017, he appeared as an attorney in lower court proceedings on behalf of all plaintiffs-appellants, including himself, in a pro hac vice capacity, in association with Attorney Michael D. Dean, “an active member of the state bar of Wisconsin who appear[ed] and participate[d] in the action or proceeding,” as required by SCR 10.03(4)(b).

Page 2

February 15, 2024

No. 2022AP1069

Eagle Cove Camp & Conference Center v. Oneida County Board of Adjustment, L.C.# 2013CV345

On November 14, 2023, the court of appeals issued a decision adverse to the plaintiffs-appellants. Through Attorneys Dean and Jaros, the plaintiffs-appellants moved the court of appeals to reconsider its decision, which the court of appeals declined to do by order of December 6, 2023.

On January 5, 2024, Attorney Jaros filed a document titled “Petition of Arthur G. Jaros, Jr. For Review.” This document suggests that Attorney Jaros is no longer appearing in this matter as an attorney for plaintiffs-appellants in a pro hac vice capacity. The cover of the petition states that it was submitted by “Arthur G. Jaros, Jr., Pro Se,” and the petition lacks any mention of Attorney Dean. Cf. Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.85(2)(a) (requiring that pro hac vice counsel have their Wisconsin-licensed co-counsel “sign every document filed in the court”).

On February 8, 2024, Attorney Dean filed a document titled “Motion of Michael D. Dean to Withdraw as Counsel of Record.” Attorney Dean states in his motion that he “no longer represent[s] Plaintiffs-Appellants” and that “Attorney Jaros advises that he has filed the pending Petition for Review pro se.”

As stated above, these documents raise several concerns. First, if this court were to grant Attorney Dean’s motion to withdraw, Attorney Jaros’ pro hac vice admission would be subject to revocation, unless he associates himself with another Wisconsin-licensed attorney. See SCR 10.03(4)(b).

Second, Attorney Dean’s motion to withdraw does not comply with Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.85(5), which mandates a detailed procedure for counsel to follow in seeking withdrawal during appellate proceedings. Attorney Dean’s motion to withdraw appears to disregard this procedure entirely.

Third, to the extent that Attorney Jaros now intends to proceed pro se in this court—i.e., to represent only himself and cease his years-long representation of the other three plaintiffs-appellants—he must seek withdrawal from representation of the other plaintiffs-appellants in the manner provided in Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.85(5). There is nothing to indicate that he has done so.

Fourth, to the extent that Attorney Jaros, in the “Petition of Arthur G. Jaros, Jr. For Review,” advocates pro se for the legal interests of plaintiffs-appellants other than himself, he is at risk of perpetrating the unauthorized practice of law. A non-Wisconsin-licensed attorney who is not appearing in a pro hac vice capacity is prohibited from acting in a representative capacity for others in Wisconsin courts. See SCR 23.02(1) (“No person may engage in the practice of law in Wisconsin, or attempt to do so, or make a representation that he or she is authorized to do so, unless the person is currently licensed to practice law in Wisconsin by the Wisconsin Supreme Court and is an active member of the State Bar of Wisconsin.”); see also Wis. Stat. § 757.30(2) (defining the practice of law to include “appear[ing] as agent, representative or attorney, for or on behalf of any other person, or any firm, partnership, association or corporation in any action or

Page 3

February 15, 2024

No. 2022AP1069

Eagle Cove Camp & Conference Center v. Oneida County Board of
Adjustment, L.C.# 2013CV345

proceeding in or before any court of record”); see also Jadair Inc. v. U.S. Fire Ins. Co., 209 Wis. 2d 187, 202, 562 N.W.2d 401 (1997) (holding that “only lawyers can appear on behalf of, or perform legal service for, corporations in legal proceedings before Wisconsin courts”).

In light of the above,

IT IS ORDERED that the January 5, 2024 “Petition of Arthur G. Jaros, Jr. For Review” and the February 8, 2024 “Motion of Michael D. Dean to Withdraw as Counsel of Record” are held in abeyance pending further order of this court; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, within 14 calendar days of the date of this order, Attorney Michael D. Dean and Arthur G. Jaros, Jr., shall file a response, either joint or separate, addressing the concerns expressed in this order.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court