

**FILED  
01-10-2024  
CLERK OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS**

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT II

APPEAL NOS. 2023AP2156, AND  
2023AP2157  
CIRCUIT COURT CASE NOS. 2022TP000059, AND  
2022TP000060

In re the Termination of Parental Rights of  
R.A.C. and R.F.,  
Persons Under the Age of 18:

Kenosha County Division of Children & Family Services,  
Petitioner-Respondent,

v.

R.M.F.,  
Respondent-Appellant.

ON APPEAL FROM THE ORDERS TERMINATING THE PARENTAL RIGHTS  
ENTERED IN KENOSHA COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, THE HONORABLE  
BRUCE E. SCHROEDER PRESIDING  
BRANCH 3

BRIEF OF PETITIONER-RESPONDENT

BY:

Thomas C. Binger  
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
STATE BAR NO. 1027874  
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
912 56<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
KENOSHA, WI 53140  
(262) 653-2400

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

STATEMENT ON ORAL ARGUMENT AND PUBLICATION..... 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4

ARGUMENT..... 5

    I. JUDGE SCHROEDER’S INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATION OF THE CASE TO THE JURY PRIOR TO VOIR DIRE WAS NOT IMPROPER AND DID NOT CONSTITUTE A STRUCTURAL ERROR..... 5

    II. JUDGE SCHROEDER’S COMMENTS REGARDING THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN WERE NOT IMPROPER..... 12

CONCLUSION..... 13

CERTIFICATION..... 14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**WISCONSIN CASES CITED**

<u>In re Kristeena A.M.S.</u> , 230 Wis.2d 460 (Ct. App. 1999).....	12
<u>In re Paternity of B.J.M.</u> , 392 Wis.2d 49 (2020).....	9
<u>Liteky v. United States</u> , 510 U.S. 540, 555, 114 S. Ct. 1147, 1157, 127 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1994).....	8
<u>State v. Dorsey</u> , 379 Wis.2d 386, 423 (2018).....	12
<u>State v. Ford</u> , 306 Wis.2d 1, 18 (2007).....	7
<u>State v. Goodson</u> , 320 Wis.2d 166, 173 (Ct. App. 2009).....	8,9
<u>State v. Herrmann</u> , 364 Wis.2d 336, 348 (2015).....	8,9
<u>State v. Huebner</u> , 235 Wis. 2d 486, 492 (2000).....	10
<u>State v. Marcotte</u> , 392 Wis.2d 183 (Ct. App. 2020).....	9
<u>State v. Pinno</u> , 356 Wis. 2d 106, 136 (2014).....	7
<u>State v. Travis</u> , 347 Wis.2d 142, 166, 167 (2013).....	7

**STATUTES CITED**

Wis. Stats. §48.415(2).....	5
-----------------------------	---

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT II

APPEAL NOS. 2023AP2156, AND  
2023AP2157  
CIRCUIT COURT CASE NOS. 2022TP000059, AND  
2022TP000060

---

In re the Termination of Parental Rights of  
R.A.C. and R.F.,  
Persons Under the Age of 18:

Kenosha County Division of Children & Family Services,  
Petitioner-Respondent,

v.

R.M.F.,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

ON APPEAL FROM THE ORDERS TERMINATING THE PARENTAL RIGHTS  
ENTERED IN KENOSHA COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, THE HONORABLE  
BRUCE E. SCHROEDER PRESIDING  
BRANCH 3

---

BRIEF OF PETITIONER-RESPONDENT

---

**STATEMENT ON ORAL ARGUMENT AND PUBLICATION**

Oral argument and publication are not necessary.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Respondent-Appellant R.F. (hereinafter "father")  
appeals from an order terminating his parental rights to  
his children, R.A.C and R.F., which was entered by Judge  
Bruce Schroeder of the Kenosha County Circuit Court on June

2, 2023. Judge Schroeder presided over a 4 day jury trial which took place on April 17-20, 2023 wherein a jury unanimously found that both children were in continuing need of protection or services pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 48.415(2). The Court then held a disposition hearing on June 1, 2023 and found that it was in the best interests of the children to terminate the father's rights.

#### **ARGUMENT**

- I. JUDGE SCHROEDER'S INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATION OF THE CASE TO THE JURY PRIOR TO VOIR DIRE WAS NOT IMPROPER AND DID NOT CONSTITUTE A STRUCTURAL ERROR.

Before jury selection began, Judge Schroeder gave a lengthy explanation of the nature of the case to the jury. This explanation takes up almost all of pages 2 through 7 of the Respondent-Appellant's brief and will not be reproduced in its entirety here. During the explanation, Judge Schroeder pointed out that the "petitioner has asserted a number of grounds" to terminate the father's rights and it is up to the jury "to determine whether those grounds exist." (R. 119, p. 24). Judge Schroeder then summarized portions of an attachment to the Petition for Termination of Parental Rights wherein the grounds were set forth. He pointed out that "the burden of proof is on [the petitioner] to prove by evidence which is clear, convincing

and satisfactory that the grounds are sustained". (Id., pp. 25-26).

Judge Schroeder explained to the jury that court orders placed the children outside of the parental home and those orders set forth conditions that the father would have to meet for the return of his children. (Id., pp. 27-32). It should be noted that all of the court orders were introduced into evidence without objection, that the father stipulated to everything that Judge Schroeder read to the jury about those orders, and that the special verdict question on this issue was later answered "yes" by the Court with the father's consent.

At the very end of his comments, Judge Schroeder informed the jury that the Petition for Termination of Parental Rights alleged that grounds existed to terminate the father's rights, that the Department made reasonable efforts to provide the services ordered by the court, and that the father failed to meet the conditions for return of his children. (Id., pp. 32-33). He went on to say that the Petition alleged that the father is an unfit parent and that the Petition alleged that "it is in the child's best interests to terminate the parental rights of each of these parents; that's what the dispute is all about. As I have

indicated, the pleas have been denial" and now a jury trial would commence. (Id. at 33).

The father asserts that Judge Schroeder's summary of the allegations in the Petition for Termination of Parental Rights constitutes a "structural error" which demands reversal. This argument lacks merit. Structural errors "'seriously affect the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings and are so fundamental that they are considered per se prejudicial.'" *State v. Travis*, 347 Wis.2d 142, 166 (2013) (citation omitted). The *Travis* Court noted that "[a] structural error is a 'defect affecting the framework within which the trial proceeds, rather than simply an error in the trial process itself.'" *Id.* at 166-67 (citation omitted). These types of errors "infect the entire trial process and necessarily render a trial fundamentally unfair." *Id.* at 167 (citation omitted). Structural errors have been found in only a "very limited class of cases". *State v. Ford*, 306 Wis.2d 1, 18 (2007) (citation omitted). The Wisconsin Supreme Court has explained that:

The limited class of structural errors include: complete denial of the right to counsel, a biased judge, excluding members of the defendant's race from a grand jury, denial of the right to self-representation, denial of the right to a public trial, and a defective reasonable doubt instruction.

*State v. Pinno*, 356 Wis. 2d 106, 136 (2014).

Judicial bias is the only "structural error" that the father alleges occurred in this case. "There is a presumption that a judge has acted fairly, impartially, and without prejudice." *State v. Herrmann*, 364 Wis.2d 336, 348 (2015). To rebut this presumption, the father must show judicial bias by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* Courts have developed two tests for evaluating a judge's impartiality: a subjective and an objective test. *State v. Goodson*, 320 Wis.2d 166, 173 (Ct. App. 2009). The father has not argued that Judge Schroeder was subjectively biased.

Objective bias can occur where there is an appearance of bias such that a reasonable person would question the court's impartiality. *Id.* It can also occur where there are objective facts showing that the judge treated a party unfairly. *Id.* However, the United States Supreme Court has held that a judge's comments during a trial are rarely sufficient to demonstrate judicial bias: "[J]udicial remarks during the course of a trial that are critical or disapproving of, or even hostile to, counsel, the parties, or their cases, ordinarily do not support a bias or partiality challenge." *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555, 114 S. Ct. 1147, 1157, 127 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1994).



The father has not cited a single case where a judge's comments to a jury constituted a "structural error".

Examples of judicial bias include a situation where a judge was "friends" with a party on a social network and failed to disclose this fact to the other parties (*In re Paternity of B.J.M.*, 392 Wis.2d 49 (2020)); a judge promising to sentence a defendant to the maximum sentence if he violated probation (*State v. Goodson*, 320 Wis.2d 166 (Ct. App. 2009)); a drug court judge who told a participant that he would go to prison if he failed drug court and then later presided over the defendant's sentencing after revocation and sentenced the defendant to prison (*State v. Marcotte*, 392 Wis.2d 183 (Ct. App. 2020)). On the other hand, a judge's reference to her sister's death in a car accident when sentencing a defendant for homicide by intoxicated use of a vehicle did not demonstrate actual bias. *State v. Herrmann*, 364 Wis.2d 336 (2015). Judge Schroeder's explanation of the allegations in the Petition and the Petitioner's burden of proof in this case does not even begin to approach any of these cases.

When determining whether the father has met his burden of showing objective bias, it is important to put Judge Schroeder's comments in context. They occurred prior to jury selection and prior to the jury being sworn. The

comments were an attempt to explain the case and the process to the jury. There was no contemporaneous objection to the comments. "Issues that are not preserved at the circuit court, even alleged constitutional errors, generally will not be considered on appeal." *State v. Huebner*, 235 Wis. 2d 486, 492 (2000). By failing to object during the trial, the father has waived this issue on appeal.

The father complains that the Judge's statement that "pleas have been denial" was "most likely lost on the jury pool, especially coming at the tail end of the Judge's verbose presentation." *Appellant's brief* at p. 7. This is an interesting argument, since it applies equally to the parts of Judge Schroeder's comments to which the father objects. Judge Schroeder's comments begin on page 21 of the April 17, 2023 transcript and continue on for 13 pages without interruption. (R. 119, pp. 21-33). Judge Schroeder spoke for 11 pages before he made the comments to which the father objects. In his brief, the father acknowledges that Judge Schroeder's "rambling explanation seemed more confusing than enlightening..." *Appellant's brief* at p. 9.

Despite this, the father asserts that Judge Schroeder was not a passive decision-maker but rather acted as an

advocate who took an active role in trying the case for the Petitioner. *Appellant's brief* at p. 8. This assertion is unsubstantiated hyperbole. Judge Schroeder never told the jury that either party was correct or should prevail in the case, other than to answer questions 1 and 2 on the Special Verdict form in favor of the Petitioner-Respondent with the consent of all parties. Neither Judge Schroeder nor any party ever argued to the jury that it was in the childrens' best interests to terminate the father's parental rights.

Other than the comments prior to jury selection by Judge Schroeder, the father has not identified any other portion of the record to support his contention that the judge was biased. The jury trial in this case lasted 4 days. Numerous witnesses testified, including the father, and 33 exhibits were received into evidence. The father has not argued that Judge Schroeder excluded any witness, violated his rights in any other way, or made any other improper comments.

The father admits that when the trial had concluded, Judge Schroeder properly instructed the jury. *Appellant's brief* at p. 14. In fact, Judge Schroeder instructed the jury that if they had "an impression that I have an opinion one way or another in this case", that they should "disregard that impression entirely and decide the issues

solely as you view the evidence". (R. 44). Judge Schroeder also instructed the jury that they should not consider the best interests of the children when making their decision. (*Id.*). Jurors are presumed to follow the instructions that are given to them by the Court. *State v. Dorsey*, 379 Wis.2d 386, 423 (2018). To the extent that there was any error in the statements made by Judge Schroeder, his instructions to the jury cured them.

II. JUDGE SCHROEDER'S COMMENTS REGARDING THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN WERE NOT IMPROPER.

The father also asserts that Judge Schroeder "improperly injected the best interest of the child standard into the fact-finding proceedings" when he mentioned that "the petitioner has claimed that it is contrary to the best interests of these children" to maintain the father's relationship with them. *Appellant's Brief* at p. 13. The father acknowledges, however, that "[o]nly when the court or the GAL instruct the jury that it should consider the best interests of the child is there reversible error." *In re Kristeena A.M.S.*, 230 Wis.2d 460 (Ct. App. 1999) (emphasis added). That did not happen here. Neither the judge nor any other party told the jury to consider the best interests of the child. In fact, the father admits that the Court specifically instructed the

jury not to consider the best interests of the child. Judge Schroeder was clearly referencing claims made by the petitioner and was not stating his own opinion or preference. As a result, this claim lacks merit.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Circuit Court's order should be affirmed.

Dated at Kenosha, Wisconsin, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

Electronically Signed By:  
Thomas C. Binger  
Assistant District Attorney  
e Bar No. 1027874

Kenosha County  
District Attorney's Office  
912 56<sup>th</sup> Street  
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53140  
(262) 653-2400

**CERTIFICATION AS TO FORM AND LENGTH**

I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the rules contained within Section 809.19(8)(b) and (c) for a brief and appendix produced with a monospaced font. The length of this brief is 13 pages.

Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2024.

Electronically Signed By:  
Thomas C. Binger  
Assistant District Attorney  
State Bar No. 1027874  
Attorney for Petitioner-Respondent