

MICHAEL D. DEAN, LLC

ATTORNEY AT LAW

20975 SWENSON DRIVE

SUITE 125

WAUKESHA, WISCONSIN 53186

TELEPHONE
(262) 798-8044

TELEFAX
(262) 798-8045

THIS TRANSMISSION IS SUBJECT TO NOTICE BELOW

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

RECEIVED

Date: January 6, 2012

JAN 06 2012

To: Attn: Mr. A. John Voelker
Clerk of Courts

Supreme
CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS
OF WISCONSIN

Firm: Wisconsin Supreme Court

City & State: Madison, Wisconsin

Telefax Number: 608.267.0640

From: Michael D. Dean

Time Sent: 11:10 AM

No. of pages (including this one): 3

If there are any problems during transmission, please call: (262) 798 – 8044

Re: *Clinard et al. v. Brennan et al*, Case No. 2011AP2677-OA
Clinard et al. v. Brennan et al, Case No. 2011 XX 1409

Documents: (1) Letter to Clerk of Court, 5619.000.105 (2 pages).

!!IMPORTANT NOTICE!!

The information contained in this facsimile message and accompanying documents, if any, may be legally privileged and intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipient named above. This message may be an attorney-client communication, and as such is privileged and confidential. YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that if the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you have received this document in error, and that any reading, reviewing, copying, dissemination, distribution or disclosing of this message and accompanying materials, or any part thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and we will arrange to retrieve the material at no cost to you. Thank you.

MICHAEL D. DEAN, LLC
ATTORNEY AT LAW

MAILING ADDRESS:
P.O. BOX 2545
BROOKFIELD, WI 53008

17035 WEST WISCONSIN AVENUE
Suite 100
BROOKFIELD, WI 53005

Telephone: (262) 798-8044
Telefax: (262) 798-8045
Email: miked@michaelddeanllc.com

January 6, 2012

RECEIVED

JAN 06 2012

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
OF WISCONSIN

BY TELEFACSIMILE, ORIGINAL BY MAIL

Mr. A. John Voelker
Acting Clerk of Supreme Court
Wisconsin Supreme Court
110 East Main Street, Suite 215
Madison, WI 53703

Re: *Clinard et al. v. Brennan et al*, Waukesha County Circuit Court Case No. 11 CV 3995
Clinard et al. v. Brennan et al, Wisconsin Supreme Court Case No. 2011 XX 1409
Clinard et al. v. Brennan et al, Wisconsin Supreme Court Case No. 2011 AP 2677-OA

Dear Mr. Voelker:

Yesterday, intervenors filed a Motion for Leave to File a Reply Brief to Petitioners' Response to Intervenors' Motion for Recusal or Disqualification in Case No. 2011 AP 2677-OA, which petitioners filed January 3. Intervenors' Motion should be denied.

Petitioners filed the "62 page brief" that "raises a number of issues" of which intervenors complain because intervenors' initial Motion failed to identify or discuss cursory issues, authority, or argument relevant to the substance of the Motion. The burden therefore fell to petitioners to anticipate those issues, authorities, and arguments that petitioners' believed J. Gableman and the court would likely contemplate in considering intervenors' Motion, and to include in their Response the threshold background and analysis that are the ordinary obligation and province of an opening motion or brief.

As intervenors note, a reply is not contemplated under § 809.14, Stats. Further, intervenors' failure to provide an adequate initial submission should not be rewarded by the opportunity to sandbag on reply. *See, e.g., Pampered Chef v. Alexanian*, 2011 WL 2746460, 19 n. 17 (N.D.Ill., 2011) ("In order to prevent the 'sandbagging' that results from belated presentations in reply briefs, issues that could and should have been raised in an opening brief are waived." Citing *Mohamad v. Rajoub*, 634 F.3d 604, 608 (D.C.Cir.2011); *Dexia Credit Local v. Rogan*, 629 F.3d 612, 625 (7th Cir.2010); *United States v. Boyle*, 484 F.3d 943, 946 (7th Cir.2007)).¹

¹ Decisions from the Northern District of Illinois may be cited in this court. *See State v. Duchow*, 2008 WI 57 ¶ 25, n. 20, 310 Wis.2d 1, 21, 749 N.W.2d 913, 922 (*Plock v. Bd. of Educ. of Freeport Sch. Dist.*


Mr. A. John Voelker
January 6, 2012
Page Two

In the event the court does grant intervenors' motion to file a reply brief, petitioners request the opportunity to file a surreply. See *Jeffries v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA*, Slip Op. 2011 WL 5023396, 2 (N.D.Ill.,2011), citing *Franek v. Walmart Stores, Inc.*, 2009 WL 674269, *19 n. 14 (N.D.Ill. Mar.13, 2009) ("recognizing that a surreply might be appropriate 'when a moving party 'sandbags' an adversary by raising new arguments in a reply brief'").

Finally, the undersigned counsel regrets the typographical errors in petitioners' Response filed January 3. A computer drive failure that day prevented editing the penultimate draft, and having previously requested an extension of the court's December 6 briefing order, I did not wish to request a second extension beyond the filing period provided under Rules 809.63 and 809.14.

Counsel are being served by copy of this letter. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Michael D. Dean

MDD;jm

Enc.

cc: Maria S. Lazar, Esq.
Douglas M. Poland, Esq.
Jeremy P. Levinson, Esq.
5619.001.105

No. 145, 545 F.Supp.2d 755 (N.D.Ill.2007), is an unpublished opinion from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. That court adheres to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, permitting citation to unpublished opinions. Fed. R.App. P. 32.1.")