

**STATE OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT II**

**RECEIVED**

**04-20-2018**

**CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS  
OF WISCONSIN**

---

**Appeal No. 2017AP001979  
Winnebago County Circuit Court Case No. 2017TR005019**

---

**WINNEBAGO COUNTY,**

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

**LESA L. MAUS,**

Defendant-Appellant.

---

**AN APPEAL FROM THE JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN A. JORGENSEN,  
JUDGE, WINNEBAGO COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT**

---

**THE REPLY BRIEF AND APPENDIX OF THE  
DEFENDANT-APPELLANT LESA L. MAUS**

---

**By: Walter A. Piel, Jr.  
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 01023997**

**Piel Law Office  
500 W. Silver Spring Drive  
Suite K-200  
Milwaukee, WI 53217  
(414) 617-0088  
(920) 390-2088 (FAX)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
CONCLUSION .....	4
FORM AND LENGTH CERTIFICATION .....	5
CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 809.19(12).....	6
APPENDIX CERTIFICATION .....	7
APPENDIX.....	9
Excerpts from Motion Hearing. ....	ReplyApp. 1

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Page No.**

### **CASES**

#### **United States Supreme Court**

<i>Terry v. Ohio</i> , 392 U.S. 1 (1968). . . . .	6
---	---

## **ARGUMENT**

Contrary to the County's contention, the facts adduced at the motion hearing do not support the stop of Ms. Maus' vehicle. The citizen witness herein reported a beige vehicle traveling the wrong way on the Highway 41. (R.30:5/ ReplyApp. 1). Ms. Maus' vehicle was black. (R.30:9/ ReplyApp. 2). Moreover, the County places significance in Deputy Glasel's testimony that when STOC reported the offending vehicle was getting onto Highway 41, he was right behind a vehicle entering the roundabout to go northbound on Highway 41. See Brief of Plaintiff-Respondent, page 3. Clearly, from STOC's view point, the offending vehicle was actually entering the highway. Glasel testified that when he got behind Ms. Maus' vehicle, she was still in the roundabout. Furthermore, if in fact Deputy Glasel was behind the offending vehicle as it entered the highway, and if it was being monitored by STOC, clearly, STOC would have observed Deputy Glasel's vehicle behind the offending vehicle. There was no indication from STOC that they observed Deputy Glasel's vehicle behind the offending vehicle. Nor did STOC advise Deputy Glasel that he had stopped the correct vehicle.

(R.30:12/ ReplyApp. 3). This further illustrates that Glasel stopped the wrong vehicle.

Here, Deputy Glasel's stop was based on nothing more than an "inchoate and unparticularized suspicion or 'hunch.'" *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 27 (1968).

### **CONCLUSION**

Because of the above, the Court erred when it denied Ms. Maus' motion. This Court should vacate the judgment of conviction and reverse the trial court's order denying Ms. Maus' motion.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018.

Respectfully Submitted

Piel Law Office

---

Walter A Piel, Jr.  
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 01023997

**Mailing Address:**

500 W. Silver Spring Drive  
Suite K200  
Milwaukee, WI 53217  
(414) 617-0088  
(920) 390-2088 (FAX)

## **FORM AND LENGTH CERTIFICATION**

The undersigned hereby certify that this brief and appendix conform to the rules contained in secs. 809.19(6) and 809.19(8) (b) and (c). This brief has been produced with a proportional serif font. The length of this brief is 10 pages. The word count is 1082.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018.

Respectfully Submitted

Piel Law Office

---

Walter A Piel, Jr.  
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 01023997

**Mailing Address:**

500 W. Silver Spring Drive  
Suite K200  
Milwaukee, WI 53217  
(414) 617-0088  
(920) 390-2088 (FAX)

**CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE  
809.19(12)**

I hereby certify that:

I have submitted an electronic copy of this brief, excluding the appendix, if any, which complies with the requirements of s. 809.19(12).

I further certify that:

This electronic brief is identical in content and format to the printed form of the brief filed as of this date.

A copy of this certificate has been served with the paper copies of this brief filed with the court and served on all opposing parties.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Piel Law Office

---

Walter A. Piel, Jr.  
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 01023997

## **APPENDIX CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that filed with this brief, either as a separate document or as a part of this brief, is an appendix that complies with s. 809.19(2)(a) and that contains: (1) a table of contents; (2) relevant trial court record entries; (3) the findings or opinion of the trial court; and (4) portions of the record essential to an understanding of the issues raised, including oral or written rulings or decisions showing the trial court's reasoning regarding those issues.

I further certify that if this appeal is taken from a circuit court order or a judgment entered in a judicial review of an administrative decision, the appendix contains the findings of fact and conclusions of law, if any, and final decision of the administrative agency.

I further certify that if the record is required by law to be confidential, the portions of the record included in the appendix are reproduced using first names and last initials instead of full names of persons, specifically including juveniles and parents of juveniles, with a notation that the portions of the record have been so reproduced to preserve confidentiality and with appropriate references to the record.



Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Walter A. Piel, Jr.  
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 01023997

## **APPENDIX**