



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

05-21-2025

CLERK OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

May 21, 2025

To:

Hon. Daniel G. Wood
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Tyler C. Frick
Electronic Notice

Miranda Christensen
Clerk of Circuit Court
Adams County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Jamie J. Stickney
Electronic Notice

Brian Keenan
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707

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

No. 2025AP873-OA Stickney v. The Hon. Daniel G. Wood, L.C. #2025CV21

On April 25, 2025, petitioners, Jamie J. Stickney and Tyler C. Frick, pro se, filed a petition to commence an original action under Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.70. On May 5, 2025, the petitioners filed five additional documents in this court: 1) a cover letter; 2) a motion to withdraw the petition for original action; 3) a motion to “recast” the case as a supervisory writ petition before the court of appeals and transfer jurisdiction to that court; 4) a petition for supervisory writ before the court of appeals; and 5) a memorandum in support of the supervisory writ petition. Then, on May 20, 2025, petitioners filed a document captioned, “Notice of Voluntary Dismissal,” indicating that they no longer wished to pursue this matter.

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for leave to commence an original action is dismissed and all other requests for relief filed in this matter are denied, ex parte; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the court hereby imposes filing restrictions on Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney, as detailed in the attachment to this order, and for the reasons stated in the attachment.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court

Page 2

May 21, 2025

No. 2025AP873-OA

Stickney v. The Hon. Daniel G. Wood, L.C. #2025CV21

ATTACHMENT

Filing Restrictions

The court imposes the following filing restrictions as a result of Tyler Frick and Jamie Stickney's abusive filing practices as detailed below.

Since April 14, 2025, Tyler Frick has filed the following seven matters in this court either as a petitioner or co-petitioner, acting pro se:

Frick v. Mayfield, 2025AP557

Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. IV, 2025AP756-W

Frick v. Circuit Court for Wood County, 2025AP757-W

Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. IV, 2025AP764-W

Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. IV, 2025AP765-W

Frick v. Mayfield, 2025AP868

Stickney v. The Honorable Daniel G. Wood, 2025AP873

These cases have, in total, included more than 100 separate filings.

On April 23, 2025, this court issued an order in the first five cases listed above, indicating that "[t]he sheer volume and frequency of these filings constitute an abuse of process by Mr. Frick, given the limited resources of this court." The court noted that in one of the cases, Mr. Frick appeared to be "attempting to represent another individual before this court, despite not being a licensed attorney," and that "[t]his court possesses the inherent authority to curb abusive filing practices, including restricting a litigant's ability to access the court." See S. Ct. Order, Nos 2025AP557, 2025AP756-W, 2025AP757-W, 2025AP764-W, and 2025AP765-W (Apr. 23, 2025.) At the time the court issued this order, Frick had submitted at least 75 different filings, including over 50 filings in a single day. We warned Mr. Frick that "if he continues his serial filings in the above-referenced matters, this court will impose filing restrictions." We indicated that those filing restrictions could include the following: "a declaration by the court that the filings in the above-listed cases are now closed; an elimination of Mr. Frick's eligibility to file documents in this court via the e-filing system and a limitation to paper filing; and restrictions on Mr. Frick's ability to represent himself in a pro se capacity before this court."

Following the entry of the April 23, 2025 order, Mr. Frick moved to voluntarily dismiss the first five cases listed above, and the court entered dismissal orders shortly thereafter. However, the very next day, Mr. Frick filed a petition for leave to commence an original action in Frick v. Mayfield, 2025AP868, which duplicated the claims and relief sought in one or more of his previous matters. Four days later, Mr. Frick moved to voluntarily dismiss that matter as well, and an order dismissing that case was entered the same day.

In the interim, on April 25, 2025, Mr. Frick and Jamie Stickney commenced the present petition for leave to commence an original action as co-petitioners. The petition relates to a dispute

Page 3

May 21, 2025

No. 2025AP873-OA

Stickney v. The Hon. Daniel G. Wood, L.C. #2025CV21

over filing fees in Adams County Circuit Court Case No. 2025CV21, a quiet title action in which both Ms. Stickney and Mr. Frick sought indigency fee waivers. The circuit court denied the waivers, concluding that Ms. Stickney was not indigent and that Mr. Frick had no basis for filing documents in that matter, as he was not a party and could not represent Ms. Stickney because Mr. Frick is not an attorney. In the present matter, Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney seek, among other things, recovery of the filings fees they paid and related filing and service fees that Mr. Frick claims to have incurred on Ms. Stickney's behalf, acting as her "attorney-in-fact."

This is not the first time Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney have attempted to obtain relief from the circuit court's fee waiver determinations in that case. In Appeal No. 2025AP312, Mr. Frick, purporting to act as Ms. Stickney's "attorney-in-fact," sought leave to appeal the circuit court's non-final orders denying the fee waiver petitions in Adams County Circuit Court Case No. 2025CV21. Mr. Frick then voluntarily dismissed that appeal on February 27, 2025. However, on April 14, 2025, Mr. Frick moved to reinstate that appeal. When the court of appeals did not act on his motion as quickly as he desired, Mr. Frick commenced a supervisory writ proceeding in this court, 2025AP765-W—one of the cases listed above. In that proceeding, Mr. Frick sought a supervisory writ and an order from this court "[d]irect[ing] reimbursement of \$201.45 in filing fees and \$114.00 in service fees incurred due to the improper denial of a fee waiver in Adams County Circuit Court." Also in that proceeding, Mr. Frick filed a "limited power of attorney" by Ms. Stickney appointing Mr. Frick as her "attorney-in-fact." For her part, Ms. Stickney submitted a "Letter of Joinder and Request for Co-Petitioner Status" in that case, indicating that the fees Mr. Frick was attempting to recover were paid on her behalf and that she had a "direct interest" in the matter. Mr. Frick, acting "in his capacity as attorney-in-fact for Jamie Stickney," also requested an opt-in electronic filing code for Ms. Stickney in that matter, declaring that Ms. Stickney was "the real party in interest" and that he was authorized "to act on her behalf" in court filings. Mr. Frick further filed a letter directed to the clerk of this court, restating these representations and indicating that Ms. Stickney was "the actual plaintiff" in the action and that he was "seek[ing] relief on Jamie's behalf."

After that writ proceeding was voluntarily dismissed, Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney filed the present petition for leave to commence an original action as co-petitioners, each seeking recovery of the filings fees in the Adam's County civil matter and Mr. Frick's related expenditures. In the petition, Mr. Frick indicates that while he previously appeared as "attorney-in-fact" for Ms. Stickney, he "does not seek to act in that capacity for purposes of this Original Action." However, on May 2, 2025, Ms. Stickney submitted a "Motion to Place Proceedings in Abeyance." That motion represented that Mr. Frick is providing Ms. Stickney with "guidance," "assist[ance]," and "managing legal matters" and that his "knowledge of the legal process and court procedures" is essential for Ms. Stickney's participation. The motion described that Mr. Frick was "experiencing a severe mental health crisis" and "is not able to participate due to his condition." Ms. Stickney requested that the case be held in abeyance "until [Frick] is able to return and assist with the case." The same day as this motion was filed, Ms. Stickney filed a "Notice of Withdrawal of Motion for Abeyance," in which she indicated that "Tyler Frick and Jamie Stickney intend to proceed with this original action without delay . . . and both Petitioners will continue to coordinate their efforts to move this matter forward in good faith."

Page 4

May 21, 2025

No. 2025AP873-OA

Stickney v. The Hon. Daniel G. Wood, L.C. #2025CV21

As this court previously warned Mr. Frick in the April 23, 2025 order it issued in the above referenced cases, this court has the inherent power to regulate the activities of abusive litigants through the imposition of filing restrictions. Minniecheske v. Griesbach, 161 Wis. 2d 743, 748 N.W.2d 760 (Ct. App. 1991). Mr. Frick's actions since the court issued its April 23, 2025 order demonstrates his continued abuse of the appellate court system and that he has not heeded the court's warning. With respect to the present matter, Mr. Frick has now instituted no less than three separate appellate proceedings involving the same underlying request for relief, and seeks the ability to institute a fourth one.

This court is also seriously concerned that Mr. Frick's actions and statements in Adams County Circuit Court Case No. 2025CV21, Appeal No. 2025AP312, Appeal No. 2025AP765-W, and Ms. Stickney's representations as to Mr. Frick's involvement in the present matter, indicate that Mr. Frick is misusing his ability to file as a pro se litigant in a manner that arguably violates the provisions of WIS. STAT. § 757.30 and SCR Chapter 23, prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law.

For these reasons, this court determines that it is appropriate to restrict Mr. Frick's ability to file documents in this court. Given Ms. Stickney's involvement in Appeal No. 2025AP765-W, and her statements before this court indicating that Mr. Frick is acting on her behalf in the matters relating to Adams County Circuit Court Case No. 2025CV21, this court determines that it is appropriate to extend these filing restrictions to her as well. These restrictions are as follows:

1. Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney are prohibited from using the e-filing system to file any documents before this court in any civil matter in which they appear pro se relating to, or involving the same underlying facts and circumstances at issue in, the following cases: Adams County Circuit Court Case No. 2025CV21, Adams County Case No. 2025PR16, Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. IV, Appeal No. 2025AP765-W, and Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals, Dist. IV, Appeal No. 2025AP764-W. As to Mr. Frick, this prohibition extends to any civil matter that relates to or involves the same underlying facts and circumstances at issue in Wood County Circuit Court Case No. 2025GF18, Frick v. Mayfield, Appeal No. 2025AP557, Frick v. Wisconsin Court of Appeals District IV, Appeal No. 2025AP756-W, Frick v. Wood County Circuit Court, Appeal No. 2025AP757-W, and Frick v. Mayfield, Appeal No. 2025AP868. Any documents Mr. Frick or Ms. Stickney wish to file as pro se parties with this court involving or related to the cases set forth in this paragraph must be filed by traditional paper means, through mailing or hand delivery to the Office of the Clerk of the Wisconsin Supreme Court;
2. In future civil filings before this court involving or relating to the cases set forth in the preceding paragraph 1, Mr. Frick and Ms. Stickney must either: (1) be represented by a Wisconsin-licensed attorney; or (2) obtain leave of this court to file a pro se document. Any motion for leave to file a pro se document must attach all of the following documents:
 - a. A copy of this order;

Page 5

May 21, 2025

No. 2025AP873-OA

Stickney v. The Hon. Daniel G. Wood, L.C. #2025CV21

- b. A copy of the pro se document sought to be filed; and
- c. A properly notarized affidavit that describes, with particularity, how the pro se document sought to be filed entitles Ms. Stickney or Mr. Frick to an available form of legal relief that this court can provide. The affidavit must also certify that the pro se document sought to be filed is not merely duplicative of matters already litigated or currently pending, is not legally frivolous, and complies with the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

The clerk of this court shall create and maintain miscellaneous files with the general titles “In re Tyler Frick” and “In re Jamie Stickney” and assign “XX” case numbers to each file. These miscellaneous files shall serve as the repository of this order, all motions for leave file a pro se document that comply with this order but are denied by the court, and any order entered pursuant to this order. The clerk shall also maintain dockets associated with the miscellaneous files.

If Mr. Frick or Ms. Stickney submit a motion for leave to file a pro se document that does not fully comply with this court, the clerk shall return the submission, unfiled.

As to any motion for leave to file a pro se document that fully complies with this order, the court will deny the motion if the pro se document sought to be filed is merely duplicative of matters already litigated or currently pending in other courts, legally frivolous, or does not comply with the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

The clerk shall retain any such denial order and a copy of the motion in the miscellaneous file and cause a copy of the order to be mailed to the person or persons submitting it. If the court grants the motion, the clerk shall enter the motion, grant order, and pro se document in the appropriate case file and shall also retain a copy of the grant order in the miscellaneous file and cause a copy of the order to be mailed to the person or persons submitting said motion.