

G.H.R.
C.L.R.
E.M.R.

STATE OF WISCONSIN, COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT 2

In the interest of J.C.R., a person under the age of 18;

MANITOWOC County Human Services)
926 S. 8th MANITOWOC WI 5422C)

(party designation) Peter Conrad)

Petitioner - Respondent
-vs-

K.R)
2000 Johnston Dr #25 Manitowoc WI 54220)

(party designation) K.R)

Respondent - Appellant

**Brief
Cover**

Consolidated

2022AP1975, 2022AP1977
Case No. 2022AP1977
2022AP1978

FILED

SEP 07 2023

CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS
OF WISCONSIN

ON APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR MANITOWOC COUNTY,

THE HONORABLE (Name of Judge) Judge DEWANE, Roherer, Dietz, PRESIDING

BRIEF OF K.R. Appellant *

Name: K.R.
State Bar No. (if applicable): _____
Address: 2000 Johnston Dr #25 Manitowoc WI 54220
Telephone No.: _____
Email Address (if any): _____

NOTE:

This form is for use in the Court of Appeals beginning July 1, 2021. During the transition to electronic filing, briefs submitted in the Supreme Court may have different requirements. Please consult the appellate eFiling website or call the Clerk of the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals for up-to-date information.

* STATE THE PARTY'S STATUS in the circuit court *and* in the appellate court (e.g., Plaintiff-Appellant, Defendant-Appellant, Plaintiff-Respondent, etc.).

CERTIFICATION OF FORM AND LENGTH

I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the rules contained in Wis. Stats. § (Rule) 809.19(8)(b), (bm) and (c) for a brief. The length of this brief is 32 PG and
[pages] [words].

Date: 8-27-2023

K.R

Signature

NOTE:

The certification of form and length must be filed with each brief filed by an attorney. The certification is not required for a self-represented party. The certification may be included at the end of the brief or submitted as a separate document. See Wis. Stat. ch. (Rule) 809 for additional form and length requirements.

APPELLANT'S CERTIFICATION OF APPENDIX

I hereby certify that filed with this brief is an appendix that complies with Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.19 (2) (a) and that contains, at a minimum: (1) a table of contents; (2) the findings or opinion of the circuit court; (3) a copy of any unpublished opinion cited under § 809.23 (3) (a) or (b); and (4) portions of the record essential to an understanding of the issues raised, including oral or written rulings or decisions showing the circuit court's reasoning regarding those issues.

I further certify that if this appeal is taken from a circuit court order or 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 one or more initials or other appropriate pseudonym or designation 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.

Date: 8-28-2023

K. R.
Signature

NOTE:

The appellant's certification of appendix must be filed with each appendix filed by an attorney. The certification is not required for a self-represented party. The certification may be included at the end of the appendix or submitted as a separate document. See §§ 809.19 (3) (b) and 809.19 (8g) (b) 2. regarding certification of a supplemental appendix.

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I certify that this brief or appendix was deposited in the United States mail for delivery to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals by first-class mail, or other class of mail that is at least as expeditious, on [Date of mailing]. I further certify that the brief or appendix was correctly addressed and postage was prepaid.

Date: 8-29-2023

[Signature]
Signature

OR

CERTIFICATION OF THIRD-PARTY COMMERCIAL DELIVERY

I certify that on [Date of delivery to carrier], this brief or appendix was delivered to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals within 3 calendar days. I further certify that the brief or appendix was correctly addressed.

Date: _____

Signature

NOTES:

The two certifications may be combined in one document for signature. Electronic filing parties may use their electronic signatures to sign. See § 809.19 (8g).

The certification of mailing or delivery should be included by a party who is filing the brief or appendix with the court by traditional methods rather than by electronic filing. Alternatively, the party may file an affidavit of mailing or delivery setting forth the same information. See § 809.80 (4) (a) and (b).

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

MANITOWOC COUNTYS
DEPT OF HUMAN SERVICES
Plaintiff/Respondent
VS.
K.R

APPEAL 2022AP1975
circuit court 19JC133,
19JC134, 19JC135, 19JC136

RESPONDENT/APPEALANT

In the interest of:

CASES

J.C.R, A person under the age of 18 (L.C 19JC133)

2022AP1975

C.L.R A person under the age of 18 (L.C 19JC134)

2022AP1976

E.M.R A person under the age of 18 (L.C 19JC.135)

2022AP1977

G.H.R A person under the age of 18 (L.C 19JC136)

2022AP1978

RECEIVED

SEP 07 2023

CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS
OF WISCONSIN**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS****DISTRICT****APPENDIX****PG 1 Statement of issue****PG 2 Summary****PG 3-24 Argument****PG 25-28 Closing****PG II Exhibits****PG 1(A) Guardianship terminated****PG 2 (A,B,C) Robert Lemke -Here are the emails between me and**

Robert Lemke the transcriber for judge deeds who openly admits in an email that the entire hearing that I requested a transcript for was held off record and there's no transcript for the fact that he has the guts to even write that in an email shows that just cord and the arrogance and the disregard for the law how can a person file an appeal if there isn't a transcript. If his job is to transcribe what exactly was he doing that day if he was off record and wasn't recording a hearing

PG 3(A,AND 4D) Letter from R.G requesting the girls

PG 4(A,B,C,D) Out of home to out of home

States R.G requested his address be sealed alienating myself and .y mother at R.G request which was a lie.

Letter from former foster parent claiming she never had issues with us in the 2 in a half yrs she had G.R

Letter to court asking for both girls and were told they were moving in a different direction

Out of home placement worker admits to seeking foster home before a relative violation of ch 48 That same letter also the worker admits she tried to find a foster home first but none we not considering family first as required by ch 48 the judge saw this same form and colluded with the department to alienate my children from me as did the guardian ad litem James Skyberg that is 5 people conspiring to violate my rights which is a crime punishable by up to 10 yrs in prison if there's more than two people are involved in the collusion

PG 5(A) Original referral.

Stating there were no impending threats and no police needed shows they had an agenda to remove the kids before they met them

PG 6(A) Aoda.

PG 7(A) Letter from R.Z requesting all 4 kids.

PG 8(A AND B) Letter from the therapist complaining.

about the county playing games subpoenaing the. Three times and never asking them one

question they did that intentionally to keep me from subpoena on them and to keep me from cross-examining them if they don't ask him a question

PG 9(A-M). Psychosexual assessment.

Where Jane the therapist specifically says that before I can see my kids I should have to go to a therapist and confess to a crime I didn't commit and apologize to the alleged victim problem is I didn't go to trial I didn't take a plea and there is no victim it was dismissed CPS has nothing to suggest that any sexual assault occurred however Jane goes by cps's substantiation and even go so far as to say if I should be found not guilty I'm I'm still guilty because CPS has a preponderance of the evidence which they don't because the case didn't go to trial there was no plea deal taken it was strictly dismissed they had no evidence and then it didn't say we're taking a try to play it down

PG 10(A AND B) LETTER from therapist Shaundra stating is clear that Jr has a significant bond with both his grandma K.H and both his mom and dad (ME)

PG 11(A AND B) Statues

Illinois vs Lisa Shelton. 06C4259

We all know federal law trans State law so that law applies here as well in Wisconsin.

That's it

Illinois and federal law regarding judges becoming trespassers of court and losing jurisdiction anything after that point becomes an old void and they've been acting under color of law since the start of this case so the entire case should be null and void because they had no jurisdiction to make any rulings

So we are clear I have never waived jurisdiction since the start of the case that's all I've

preached the entire case was they lack subject matter jurisdiction because even according to the Statue guardianship cases belong where they started in guardianship Court probate however every other judge up in the circuit Court says that every Court in that courthouse is guardian however I've never seen him hold one guardianship hearing in any of those courtrooms. As well as evictions the course other courts handle criminal and civil trials

PG II

preached the entire case was they lack subject matter jurisdiction because even according to the Statute guardianship cases belong where they started in guardianship Court probate however every other judge up in the circuit Court says that every Court in that courthouse is guardian however I've never seen him hold one guardianship hearing in any of those courtrooms. As well as evictions the course other courts handle criminal and civil trials

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

- 1.) DISCRIMINATED AGAINST MY SEX AND DISABILITY
- 2.) VIOLATED DUE PROCESS BEGINNING ON DAY 1
- 3.) I WAS DISABLED WHEN THIS CASE STARTED AND I WAS NEVER APPOINTED A GUARDIAN AD LITEM AT THE VERY INITIAL HEARING HOWEVER THE MOTHER WAS
- 4.) I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO HAVE MY LEGAL GUARDIAN PRESENT AT ANY OF THE HEARINGS HOWEVER THE MOTHER OF THE CHILDREN WAS ALLOWED TO, I WASN'T ALLOWED TO HAVE ANYONE AT THE HEARINGS WITH ME HOWEVER THE MOTHER WAS ALLOWED HAVE HER SISTER AT MEETINGS AND HEARINGS AND SHE WASN'T INTERESTED PARTY
- 5.) I WAS TOLD I WOULD NEVER HAVE CONTACT WITH MY CHILDREN AGAIN UNLESS I APOLOGIZED TO AN ALLEGED VICTIM, AND WENT TO A THERAPIST TO HONOR ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUALLY ASSAULTING A CHILD WHEN SHE WAS 7 (VIOLATING MY RIGHT To REMAIN SILENT AND VIOLATING My PRESUMPTION INNOCENCE UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY CRIMINAL CHARGES WERE DISMISSED NOT REDUCED OR PLED TO.
- 6.) MISUSE OF THE WORD PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

SUMMARY

In summary, the department is entrusted with the sacred trust of determining whether families are reunited, or if children should be separated from their parents permanently. This responsibility must be exercised with concern and solemnity. Everything possible must be done to accomplish reunification. That is mandated by chapter **48**.

However that is not what happened here. One year of only 2 hours a week visitation for a father who never neglected, abused, or abandoned his children, and was following up on the conditions of return. And this despite the fact that section **48.355 (1)** provides that there shall be employed those means necessary to maintain and protect the well-being of the child which are the **least restrictive of the rights of the parent and the child**, and which assure the care, treatment, or rehabilitation of the child and the family. These means employed by the department in this case were not the least restrictive as mandated, but rather were the **most restrictive**. And then K.R (myself) was totally cut off from my visitation for no apparent rational reason, and ordered to give up my right to remain silent and give up my presumption of innocence by going to a therapist and confess to a crime that never occurred and apologize to the alleged victim that until I'm found guilty. Am I supposed to lie and confess in order to see my children or not have any contact even supervised phone calls In this brief it is necessary to review a great portion of the history of these chips cases to explain how we got to this point

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

ARGUMENT

The CHIPS petition in the above-entitled action, filed on December 21, 2019, primarily contained allegations against K.H(the paternal grandmother) containing allegations regarding the abuse and neglect of S.G, a child living in the home of K.H.

J.R,G.R,C.R and E.R were never alleged to have been abused according to the dept's own admission. S.G it should be noted as a non relative the (county) placed in K.H home without a foster home license. Which had nothing to do with me (K.R) there has never been an allegation or referral I have ever abused my children or any children for that matter and was not living in the home of K.H when the abuse was going on and I have no knowledge of any abuse other than what the county has claimed, because they claim I failed to protect the children from the abuse I couldn't have custody. How could I be expected to know if abuse is occurring in a home I did not live at, next they the department placed the children with K.H against my objection and they did it anyway, I even called in a referral against her to stop them from placing the children with her and they did it anyway. 2 weeks after the children were removed they claimed S.G a child that didn't belong to me had never lived with me and I was never alone with me claimed I sexually abused her 4 yrs earlier when she was 7 the state held that case open with me out on a signature bond and no conditions other than not to have any contact with S.G the 'alleged victim. For 3 in a half yrs they allowed me out on a signature bond free to take more victims if I was a nut, but I'm not and they did that for the sole purpose to help county keep my kids from me, and to

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

keep me from reunifying with my children by saying I currently am being charged with sexual assault of a 7 yr old. 3 in a half yrs the DA and Judge Dewane had absolutely no concern for the general public as I had no conditions I couldn't be around children, schools or live with children. With that being said the department substantiated the abuse, because they claim they only need a preponderance of evidence their standard is lower than the court. Which I get, however someone should explain to the department what a preponderance of evidence is!! Preponderance of evidence does not mean no evidence. Which is why they have nothing. They have no forensics, no third party account she has never in the last 4 yrs stated that to anyone else including cps, because she made regular reports to cps but that complaint was never uttered. I the defendant had to throw a fit to get her in for a rape kit. These female social workers told me there wouldn't be any evidence after 4 yrs.. I said are you kidding me if a grown man had sex with a 7 yr old there would be scarring tearing her hymen would be gone was she checked for std. Then and only then did they say well I guess we will take her and everything came back normal including her hymen being still intact!! This child S.G has many emotional problems due to the fact her mom abandoned her for me. When I refused to allow her to live in my home or ever be left alone with her. Rather than her mom walking away from me she walked away from her own child. Never mentioned this to any other adult not even her maternal grandparents whom she lived with for up to 6 mo at a time she went to school and had cps sent to my home claiming there were drugs there and never

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

mentioned sexual abuse to anyone. She was 11 yrs old when she gave this statement and claimed it happened when she was 7 her mom was pregnant and working at mcdonalds. Let me back up the only evidence they have is an interview on camera at a child advocacy center however at the start of that interview she self proclaimed herself a liar and said she doesn't know how to stop. That's not the only time she stated that, she also said in my moms criminal case she lies all the time and doesn't know how to stop. When her mom was pregnant and working at McDonalds we were not even a couple. I have ccap records showing I couldn't have been living at the alleged residence because I was being evicted out on county Rd JJ. That's a fact. I know CCAP is not always correct however unless the owner of that house on JJ Wally Petri is cenile evicting someone that doesn't live there. That ended in his loss. The case was dismissed with prejudice, instead of being told to get out the judge let me decide when it was convenient for me to be out, which was March of 2018 after my daughter's birth. They put a restraining order against the landlord and in the end I was awarded 900 dollars in punitive costs and he was awarded my lawyer fees. With that being said CPS said that they believe her because she gave so many details, well it doesn't take a genius to describe a home at age 11 that you have been in and out of. One of the statements was the door knob was missing and they had to prop a mattress against it, first that address didn't exist and two if it did exist does it sound reasonable that the door knob was missing when she was 11 and still missing from 4 yrs ago. I can't believe detective Mccue took a picture of that missing door knob

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

allegedly from four yrs ago but couldn't muster the knowledge as a detective to look on CCAP, I mean it's free, that's scary that he's protecting us. With me on disability SSI and food stamps I could not possibly pay rent at 2 locations nor why would I.? Lets stop there, they substantiated the sexual assault, because she gave such explicit details. Well if I did not live at the address when she was 7 then all those details can't exist. The door with the missing door knob was missing when she was 11, the washer and dryer in the bathroom when she was 11, the rooms she describes were the rooms when she was 11 so I guess she would have extensive detail to explain a home that she currently visits at age 11 not 7. Once you get past the point that the address didn't exist when she was 7 and her mom was pregnant all the other details go out the window because those details relate to a current residence not a residence from 4 yrs ago and if her mom was pregnant at the time that's also telling, because that address didn't exist until after her birth and her mom was no longer pregnant. I (K.R) was denied placement of my children J.R,G.R,C.R, and E.R that had no basis in the chips petition. There's no way the court could determine whether the conclusions were accurate when they never set forth in the petition or any evidence or evidentiary hearing was ever held to determine any reasonable conclusions. The petition contained no allegations regarding myself so contained no factual allegations. The only allegations alleged in the complaint were against my mom and that is all they were, was allegations. There was never an evidentiary hearing for them to corroborate those allegations. This case involves the entire county colluding to traffic children for title 4E federal funds. The fact that I was denied placement

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

placement of my children and I'm not including S.G she is not my child and I have never resided with her or been alone with her. This case from the start contains no factual support, not even minimal support to justify the petition.

Prior to the CHIPS petition being filed, there had never been any substantiated CPS referrals regarding anyone of my children J.R, G.R C,R or E.R. All the children were removed

On Dec 20,2019 and were taken to be examined and determined none of the children had been physically or emotionally abused by their doctor of their choosing yet that was never submitted to the court and I was denied any form of due process to submit it myself. I have never been allowed to call witnesses and submit evidence and if I did through efile it went ignored and never addressed.

My children had been raised primarily by myself without the mothers.

The mother of the boys lives in a group home because she took too many drugs supplied to her by her brother who's now dead from an overdose. H.G the mother to the girls had her own issues mental health wise she was untreated for and would just take off and abandon her children including S.G on a whim and not be seen at times for months without ever so much calling to check on them. Here's where the discrimination comes in. Although I was the primary caregiver with the exception of a couple months they were with my mom K.H which by the way I objected to them going there and even called in a cps report against her to keep them from placing them there but they did anyway. I am the one that was TPR'D when I say that I don't mean on paper I mean I have no privileges, that a parent that hasn't been TPR'D has.

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

Additionally at the time of my childrens removal there were no concerns raised regarding the care of my children, not even by the caller reporting my mom.

They exploited my disability and reading comprehension. They never appointed me a guardian ad litem as they did the mother and children, they wouldn't allow my legal guardian in at any of the hearings or meetings as they did for the mother. They had me sign a waiver to my right to a trial and accept a plea deal otherwise they would not allow the children to see their grandmother or me ever again. My autistic son was having a real hard time not having contact with my mom, I have included the letter from his therapist. He had a really strong bond with her due to his fragile birth and almost dying in the hospital also me only being 19 and first time parent he lived with my mom because she had a medical background and that is what you call acting in the best interest of your child putting your wants a side for the best interest of another. Had I had an advocate or guardian ad litem there they would of likely told me not to sign it as there were no allegations on me and should go to trial, however thinking cooperating would look better trying to get my children back. Was I ever wrong? They never let my son see his grandma and stopped all contact with my children from me. They lied to get me to waive my trial and never honored the agreement. I thought I was pleading to work services however now I know I was pleading to abuse that was never even alleged in the complaint and that I was incapable of caring for my children which I did for 7 yrs. I was given a minimal 2 hrs per week visitation for one yr never moving off

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
District 2

the 2 hour visits. Then they stopped any and all contact with my children, the school, foster parents or anyone else after I took the plea, ordered me to do a physcosexual assesment and complete any and all recommendations before I could even have supervised visits or phone calls. Which included admitting to a sexual assault that never occurred and apologize to the victim, by the judges all three (JUDGE ROHER, JUDGE DEWANE AND JUDGE DIETZ) allowing that to be a part of the court order they violated my right to due process, all three They exploited my disability and reading comprhension they had me sign a waver to my right to a trial and except a plea deal otherwise they would not allow the children to see their grandmother or me ever again. My autistic son was having a real hard time not having contact with my mom, because he had a really strong bond with her due to his fragile birth and almost dying in the hospital also me only being 19 and first time parent he lived with my mom because she had a medical background and that is what you call acting in the best interest of your child putting your wants a side for the best interest of another. Had I had an advocate or guardian ad litem there they would of likely told me me not to sign it as there were no allegations on me and should go to trial, however thinking cooperating would look better trying to get my children back was I ever wrong they never did let my son see his grandma and stopped all contact with my children from me. They lied to get me to wave my trial and never honored the agreement. I thought I was pleading to work services however now I know I was pleading to abuse that was never even alleged in the complaint and that I was incapable of caring for my children which I did for 7 yrs. I was given a minimal 2 hrs

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

per week visitation for one yr never moving off the 2 hour visits. Then they stopped any and all contact with my children, the school, foster parents or anyone else after I took the plea, ordered me to do a physcosexual assesment and complete all recommendations.

before I could even have supervised visits or phone calls. Which included admitting to a sexual assault that never occurred and apologize to the victim, by the judge allowing that to be a part of the court order they violated my right to the 4th, 5th, and 6th amendment. Also my right to due process. All three judges (Judge Mark Roherer, Judge Dietz, and Judge Robert Dewane) Judge Dewane was the worst. He actually told me on the record in the court you can go confess to a crime you didn't commit to a therapist and they won't be able to use it against you at trial. They made that apart of the order violating my right to remain silent and not allowing me my constitutional right to the prosumption of innocence they could exploit my disability again and get me to confess because the state had no evidence and then they could send me to prison for 18 yrs for a rape I didn't commit just like they did with Steven Avery. They made that apart of the order violating my right to remain silent and not allowing me my constitutional right to the prosumption of innocence they could exploit my disability again and get me to confess because the state had no evidence and then they could send me to prison for 18 yrs for a rape I didn't commit just like they did with Steven Avery. It should be noted that even when I was having the 2 hour visits I was not allowed to contact the school, go to dr appt or even be at my son's surgery when he broke his arm. Also proving there were no least restrictive measures, if I can't go to a hospital where my son is having surgery . Where it's swarming with security and other staff.

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

Demonstrating there was never a plan to reunify my children. This case started in Dec of 2019 and there were no hearings until June of 2020 except for the initial one held at 72 hrs. In Feb of 2020 they did file a dispositional order with the court within the 60 days, however they never had a hearing and you won't find a hearing or should I say opposing counsel wont find a transcript or minutes for it, because it doesn't exist. On the chance of repeating myself every single document signed by me from Dec of 2019 thru Aug of 2020 is null and void. I was incompetent during that time and not able to sign on my own behalf. I was not appointed a guardian ad litem . My guardian wasn't allowed at any of the hearings. I couldn't even see a dr in an emergency without them getting consent from my guardian. During the time they were exploiting my disability is when I signed the waiver of right to a trial. Explain to me how the children, and mother of the boys were all appointed guardian ad litem except me and I had a guardian for decades before the mother. At the very least that waver should be thrown out and they should be required to prove I abused my children and need to comply with a chips. Not a TPR trial that should be dismissed all together because of their discriminating against my gender, my disability, their failure to make reasonable efforts to reunify, their failure to consider family first. Let's not forget there were no allegations on me except after the fact and I'm able to disprove not just one but every single allegation. That is why it was dismissed. I would have been able to impeach the child but especially the detective Dave Mccue, the detective violated every oath he took. They had nothing on me so

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

They had to get me to waive my right to trial. Disabled me thought I was demonstrating I was willing to cooperate when I found out later I actually acknowledged abusing and neglecting my children when neither them nor the caller ever had one complaint of how my children were ever harmed in my care.

My only crime was refusing to allow another man's child in my home to put myself in the position of being accused of something I didn't do. That criminal complaint has been opened since Jan of 2020 when I told them to set it for trial on day one. I would not be taking a plea for so much as Jaywalking. None the less that case is still open, at the time I started this brief. However they finally scheduled the trial for AUG 28,2023 and as soon as they did that Corporation counsel tried to fast track a TPR through the court of my autistic Son in case I was found not guilty they could say too bad so sad the TPR is already done.

However they didn't count on not being able to find a lawyer for my son or his mother They also didn't expect my current criminal lawyer to write a letter to the DA explaining that if the case was not dismissed he would file a ethical complaint on her for sitting on this case for 3 yrs while I was roaming the community with a signature bond no restriction and her duty when a child victim is involved the duty to a speedy trial to alleviate the ongoing trauma of the thought of having to testify. He also laid out her case explaining what his evidence was and the only thing she had was a child witness whos impeachable because she gave several

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

interviews in different cases proclaiming to be a liar and doesn't know how to stop, and the impeachable Detective Dave McCue who didn't bother to look me up on ccap to find out the address the victim claimed it happened at didn't exist at the time it occurred and I was living with a different girl at the time. He then went on to say I stated I lived at that address for 4 yrs because the child's 11 now and had to explain how it happened there 4 yrs ago so he claimed I lived at that address for 4 yrs putting me there when she was 7 however he overplayed his hand. You see he claims I stated I lived there for 4 yrs however I have never lived anywhere for 4 yrs except when I was a child as a matter of fact at the time this supposedly occurred I was being evicted from another residence which I won and it was dismissed with prejudice, I won a 900 dollar judgment and they put a temporary restraining order on the land lord that he was not to come on his own property until I was vacated and instead of having to be out right away I was able to give the judge the date I could be out by which was march of 2018 after my baby was already born. Meaning I couldn't of been living there when Hg was pregnant.

They were using that case to look like I'm a pedophile, pervert chomo take your pick they all describe a scumbag to make a case to terminate my rights and just in the last two weeks that case was dismissed after holding it over my head for 3 in a half yrs.. I never even allowed my children to have sitters for disgusting crap like this not even friends of mine, none of them had ever done something like this but I wasn't gonna have my kids be the first. Now they have my kids around any tom dick or harry. So whos the abuser? Them, the children

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS

DISTRICT 2

can't come back to me. They have no case and if I take it to trial and win there only substantial claim against me goes out the window. Most people can't remember what they had for breakfast yesterday however I have documentation for the entire duration of the time frame.9 from the time her mother was pregnant and working at McDonalds, which is when she claims it happened. This supposedly occurred when she was 7 and did not report it until she was 11 and now in Sept she will be 15. Tell me this is justice for her or I keeping this case lingering that amount of time. The prosecutor herself violated her own oath of office and rules pertaining to child alleged victims or witnesses.

I'm enclosing the letter written to the prosecutor by my lawyer. Standard 3-4.3 minimum requirements for filing and maintaining charges **Standard 3-1.9 Dilligance, Promtness and punctuality. The prosecuter volated statue 971.105** with regard to a speedy trial for the child

witness and what about a fair trial for me who knows whos been in her ear for the last 3 in half yrs. Not to mention the fact they are dangling this over my head to get me to confess and I assure you pink elephants will fly before I confess to a sick and twisted crime **I DID NOT COMMIT.**

The CHIPS petition was as noted filed on December 20, 2019. I completed parenting course at the request of the department. I also completed an AODA assessment on February 27, 2020 by Amanda Hartwig of Froedtert and the Medical College of Wisconsin. That assessment indicated many factors were considered, including past substance abuse. The

conclusion of Ms. Hartwig was that based upon that assessment, it was determined that no

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS

DISTRICT 2

I did not have a problem with drugs or alcohol and that no treatment was recommended at this time. I had it done **before I was ordered by the court, because my mom was a former foster parent and said I'd be required to do it.**

At one point after the chip petition was filed, during the proceedings, SG, who is not a child of mine, made an allegation at school as part of the dare program that I and her mother H.G were using drugs. The police came unannounced to my residence without a warrant. I consented to a search because the allegation was false, and the police found nothing.

Shortly after the filing of the CHIPS petition, I was granted supervised visitation. This supervised visitation lasted one year, and then it was suspended. During that I on numerous occasions requested a drug test every monday specifically to verify I was not using illicit drugs. Despite my repeated requests during that one yr period, the department never scheduled a drug test for me. If the department had any even vague suspicion of drug abuse on my part why would they not have drug tested me, especially since I was asking them to drug test me.

Considering that now that I have absolutely no contact with my children they are claiming they have asked me to do a drug test and have refused which is a lie. They have never submitted to the court any no shows or cancellations where I was required to show for a drug screen. The court order states I am required to submit a drug screen as requested by the treatment provider and since she determined I don't need treatment I don't have a treatment provider. I didn't make that order the judge made that order. Those 2 hr visits were so

minimal they were almost non-existent

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

They were never increased. The department never conducted a home visit. Not surprisingly, I requested on numerous occasions that these visits be increased regarding frequency and duration. When I made these repeated requests, I was always told it would be discussed some other time. But it never was. This was inexcusable. So not only did the supervised visitation not lead to unsupervised visitation, visitation in the home, and a trial reunification, but they never were increased beyond 2 hours once a week and the department, despite my compliance and despite my repeated requests, never pursued any increase in the 2 hours per week and they never offered any justification for not increasing the frequency and time, probably because there was no justification. Certainly, this raises the specter of some bias against myself (MALE) not related to the facts of the case rather related to some other motive. This is especially disturbing considering at the time of the removal E.R. was only 22 months old and it should have been known by the department, with a child this young, bonding can only continue with frequent visitation, not 2 hours once a week. That pattern, and the suspension of all visitation in December 2020, basically constituted a TPR without a hearing... There was no evidence that I had ever failed to clothe or feed my children, ever abused them, ever neglected them that I ever failed to provide shelter for them and despite these background facts the judge nor the guardian ad litem never inquired as to what their reasoning was!! Leaving visitation at 2 hours a week for one year, with no justification. This was unconscionable and certainly not in my children's best interest. Nor is it even in

compliance with ch 48. If you are required to stop visits to protect the child its required

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

According to ch 48. They are also required to make reasonable efforts to reunify and without ever increasing visits or the most mundane of conducting a home visit to even see where the children would be living, how can they seriously claim reasonable efforts were made. Not one Considering that now that I have absolutely no contact with my children they are claiming they have asked me to do a drug test and have refused which is a lie. They have never submitted to the court any no shows or cancellations where I was required to show for a drug screen. The court order states I am required to submit a drug screen as request by the treatment provider and since she determined I don't have to do treatment I don't This is especially disturbing considering at the time of the removal E.R was only 22 mo old and it should have been known by the department, with a child this young, bonding can only continue with frequent visitation, not 2 hours once a week. That pattern, and the suspension of all visitation in December 2020, basically constituted a TPR without a hearing... There was no evidence that I had ever failed to clothe or feed my children,ever abused them,ever neglected them that I ever failed to provide shelter for them and despite these background facts the judge nor the guardian ad litem never inquired as to what their reasoning was!! Leaving visitation at 2 hours a week for one year, with no justification. This was unconscionable and certainly not in my childrens best interest. Nor is it even in compliance with ch 48. If you are required to stop visits to protect the child its required by ch 48 to be in the **least restrictive** manner to still be able to protect the children **(48.355) (1)**.

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

According to ch 48 they are also required to make reasonable efforts to reunify and without ever increasing visits or the most mundane of conducting a home visit to even see where the children would be living, how can they seriously claim reasonable efforts were made. Not one, considering that now that I have absolutely no contact with my children they are claiming they have asked me to do a drug test and have refused which is a lie. They have never submitted to the court any no shows or cancellations where I was required to show for a drug screen. The court order states I am required to submit a drug screen as requested by the treatment provider and since she determined I don't need treatment I don't have a treatment provider. I didn't make that order. The judge made that order. Those 2 hr visits were so minimal they were almost non existent.

They were never increased. The department never conducted a home visit. Not surprisingly, I requested on numerous occasions that these visits be increased regarding frequency and duration. When I made these repeated requests, I was always told it would be discussed some other time. But it never was. This was inexcusable. So not only did the supervised visitation not lead to unsupervised visitation, visitation in the home, and a trial reunification, but they never were increased beyond 2 hours once a week and the department, despite my compliance and despite my repeated requests, never pursued any increase in the 2 hours per week and they never offered any justification for not increasing the frequency and time, probably because there was no justification. Certainly raises the specter of some bias against myself (MALE) not related to the facts of the case rather to some other motive. Never once

did a home visit in 3 in a half yrs. Where is the **Reasonable efforts 48.415 (2)(a) 2.a**

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

What is the point of having a permanency plan hearing it is disclosed that 6 months after removal of a child, the father is still only being allowed to see his children 2 hours a week, and the department is not asked at that hearing to justify that action on their part (excerpt pulled from a brief my lawyer submitted) Of the two mothers and myself in this case I am the only one that has done everything I can possibly do that they will allow. I am the only one who has never missed a visit and I am the only one that has never missed a hearing, yet I'm the only one that is not allowed contact and the moms are anytime they want. Tell me that is not discrimination. This should have been raised as an issue at a permanency plan hearing during that period by the Judge or the GAL and investigated as to why the visitation was remaining in a holding pattern at 2 hours a week. It normally would require some pretty dramatic compelling circumstances for a department to pursue that course of action, namely leave visitation at 2 hours once a week for one year.

I tried to raise the subject myself. You know due process the right to be heard and the judge at that time asked corporation counsel if I could have permission to speak and his statement to the court was I don't have a right to speak because this isn't an adversarial hearing. That was a lie I did have a right to speak and this is the statute. **48.38 (5) (bm) 1...**

The permanency plans up until November 24, 2021, specified the permanence goal as reunification. Yet despite that, and my repeated requests for an increase in

visitation,visitations remained at a poultry farm 2 hours once a week for one year.

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

That should have been raised as an issue at a permanency plan hearing during that period by the Judge or the GAL and investigated as to why the visitation was remaining in a holding pattern at 2 hours a week. It normally would require some pretty dramatic compelling circumstances for a department to pursue that course of action, namely leave visitation at 2 hours once a

The permanency plans up until November 24, 2021, specified the permanence goal as reunification. Yet despite that, and my repeated requests for an increase in visitation,visitations remained at a poultry 2 hours once a week for one year. How was reunification going to be accomplished with 2 hours a week visitations? It wasn't...

On Nov 10,2021 my aunt went to court to request guardianship of the baby first because they all had different case numbers so she could only request one at a time...

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

For over a yr with cps and they wouldn't even vet her stating because my mom was adopted at the age of 7 by her foster parents she was no longer a relative.

Which was another lie for one the child my mother was accused of abusing was not a relative in any stretch of the imagination yet cps gave her that child and gave her guardianship of a child she was not related to and was not a foster parent, so we know that is a lie. Then corporate counsel told me her rights were terminated when her bio parents rights were terminated which is also a lie and here is the statute **48.38 (4) (b) 1 meaning of sibling**

proves that.. I tried to raise the subject myself. You know due process the right to be heard and the judge at that time asked corporation counsel if I could have permission to speak and his statement to the court was I don't have a right to speak because this isn't an adversarial hearing. That was a lie. I did have a right to speak and this is the statute My visitation remained at a poultry 2 hours once a week for one year. How was reunification going to be accomplished with 2 hours a week visitations? It wasn't...

On Nov 10,2021 my aunt went to court to request guardianship of the baby first because they all had different case numbers so she could only request one at a time. She had been trying for over a yr with cps and they wouldn't even vet her stating because my mom was adopted at the age of 7 by her foster parents. She was no longer a relative.

Which was another lie for one the child my mother was accused of abusing was not a relative in any stretch of the imagination yet cps gave her that child and gave her guardianship of a child she was not related to and was not a foster parent, so we know that is a lie. Then corporate counsel told me her rights were terminated when her bio parents rights were terminated which is also a lie and here is the statute that proves it. also a lie and here is the statute that proves it.

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

The revision of the dispositional order entered on April 6, 2021, in which the court entered an order continuing the department's prohibition on me having any contact with any of my children, provided that there was to be a review hearing held within 45 to 60 days after the entry of the revision order. Neither the department nor the GAL followed up to ensure that this review hearing was scheduled. In fact it was never scheduled.. So my visitation was totally suspended, and as a condition a review hearing was ordered to be conducted within 45 to 60 days, but it was never held. Once again unconscionable. The revision order also provided that that a parent support worker was to be assigned to me and never was. Once again, this was not ever implemented, and therefore no parent support worker was ever assigned to me. This constituted a serious breach of the duty of the department and the GAL to follow up on the strict parameters of this dispositional order that severed temporarily – although it turned out to be permanent any relationship between myself and my children.

After stopping all contact with my children they had me go do a psychosexual assessment and follow any recommendations for a crime I never committed. Do you know what the recommendations were, I know this has been stated before but I need to state it again to implore the illegal and unconstitutional requirement to see my children. So to sum it up I have to go confess to a crime I did not commit and get convicted of a crime I did not commit so I can see my children which I wouldn't be able to see my children then either because I would be in prison for a crime I didn't commit. let me tell you cps and the judge want me to go to a therapist and confess to a crime I did not commit and if that isn't bad enough I should go to family therapy with a child I have never lived with or been alone with so I can apologize to her and learn

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

appropriate boundaries. That's right all three Judges, Judge Mark Roher, Judge Dewane and Judge Dietz, because the kids were in front of all these judges at some point and time and lets not forget about the guardian ad litem James skyberg and last but not least corperation counsel Peter Conrad all signed off on that ridiculousness and I could not have supervised or any other contact until I did that. Someone should school them that's a violation of my constitutional right to remain silent and a presumption of innocence until proven guilty. This is exactly how false confessions happen.

So they are black mailing me to either confess or never see MY kids again. That wasn't the first time they black mailed me. The first time was when They told me in June of 2020 either my right to a trial and agree to a chips or they would stop all contact with my children. Isn't that illegal and corrupt. This request by the department that I would have no contact with any of my children until after I completed this assessment with Fox Cities made no sense and was unjustified. At the time they suspended my visitation, I had already completed the parenting course, done the AODA assessment, and completed the psychosexual report. I had one year of supervised visitation. albeit only 2 hours per week. If the department felt a parenting assessment was so important under the facts, why didn't they ask for a parenting assessment at the time of the original dispositional order, rather than waiting 6 months, and then all of the sudden not only demanding it, but incredibly suspending my visitation until I completed the parenting assessment, and followed the recommendations. Considering all of these facts, it certainly would not be unreasonable to wonder if there were some hidden agenda here in requesting this

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS

DISTRICT 2

parenting assessment, and if it was punitive. Never a teacher's report filed, a dance instructor's report filed, a big brother or big sister report filed on me, nothing. In May 2019, I was going to be confined for a period of time for an evaluation. The department wanted to place my 4 children with K.H my mother which I objected to her having them and they did it anyway. Which was ridiculous. Judge Dewane tried to find me incompetent for a charge I would probably sat no time for and he had me institutionalized for 90 days for a charge I would have likely got probation for. I believe acting in COLLUSION to take my kids. I believe that was the start of the plan.. At the time the children were removed from my mom they weren't even living with her because as the guardian she gave them back to me once I was released from mendota for that unlawful confinement, When Judge Dewayne sent me to is perfectly aware I'm competent except for S.G the one allegedly abused and my oldest son with autism, only because he was so close to my mom he didn't want to be with anyone but her. He had medical issues when he was born and she had medical training so we felt it would be in his best interest to be with her. My mother and I and his mother C.W were first time parents and right out of school. So we put our child first, that's what parents do. My mom K.H was adopted. R.Z is her biological sister. K.H and R.Z were reunited in 1983 when K.H was 16 years old. After that reunification, R.Z had a lot of contact with my children. throughout the years. At the time of the removal in December 2019, R.Z had a bond with all of my children and was also not only denied placement but any and all contact. Prisoners have more rights and access to family than my children do, and without any justification not a single negative report from any Dr, teacher, mentor, preacher, dance instructor. Nothing!!

WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2

Closing

In closing I would like to request this case be thrown out on the grounds that they have failed to meet the burden that one of my children was ever treated in any way other than a living and caring manner, according to CPS themselves. I have been denied any form of due process, wasn't allowed to be heard, call witnesses and the judges involved in these 4 cases disregarded any independent resources such as CASA or the therapist who specifically stating it was in the children's best interest for their emotional well being they be allowed cont with as many family as possible and we're struggling not having visitation.

In the event that is not able to happen I'm requesting that a change of venue be put in place because currently these workers do not return emails from me phone calls from me and have not scheduled a meeting with me even if they did schedule a meeting with me I would be afraid to go in person for fear of them making something up and having me arrested because they

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

have already claimed that I'm hostile and intimidating at meetings yet they've never made a police report had me removed from a building or anything to suggest that I was anything but appropriate. I would also like a clear-cut path to reunification if I can't have this case thrown out I would like a timeline, a visitation schedule put in place, not left up to the workers discretion and progressively increased every couple of weeks until reunification has occurred I have no problem maintaining an open case once reunifications has occurred because I have nothing to hide and my children have nothing to hide they have a right to be raised by their birth family and the fact that one child is with family and the other three are in an adoptive placement home says to those three that they weren't worth it, they're not loved they're not wanted so they're getting sold while one of the children gets to go to a family member when there's family that wants all of them and they could have been all together all four of them they have severed The sibling Bond these children were so close they did everything together they shared the same friends together they left the house together they came home together they ate together quite truthfully the only time they were without each other is in the bathroom otherwise if you saw one you saw all four they were that close and they never fought and it's traumatizing watching how their behaviors have declined. CPS says they are doing wonderful, however wonderful isn't my 5 yr old telling her teacher she's going to pick her today. So sad to see that they've been ripped apart like this for no other reason other than to gain title for funding. Not only was I not giving due

process but the judges didn't require CPS to provide any kind of corroboration or proof that any one of their allegations were even remotely possibly true. Thank you for your time and this most important matter. Let's not forget about the county discriminating against me because I'm a man and failing

**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT 2**

to appoint me a guardian ad litem. This case has gone passed legal error it's crossed the line from error to criminal. When a guardian ad litem tells me to my face he don't need to meet the children , or do any interviews he strictly goes by what CPS wants to do and that is anything but an independent fact finder. James Skyberg the guardian ad litem should be disbarred

- 1.) One very important thing I forgot to mention, when they gave me my reunifications, I said no problem I'll get started right away and Stephanie Willis said I don't know why you're in such a hurry? It's not like a checklist and I said well yes it is and she said well you're not getting the kids back and I said then why do you have me doing all this stuff and Stephanie said because I have to by law. That's why they don't allow you to record meetings or hearings because social workers say goofy things like that and they don't want a record of it.
- 2.) Discrimination against my disability and sex
- 3.) Violation of my due process
- 4.) Violation of my children's rights to have a loving relationship with their biological family
- 5.) Placing my children in homes to be raped, sexually assaulted, brake arms

fractured wrists, leave my 18 mo old unattended to where she had enough time to completely undress another child younger than her. What if instead of undressing her she picked the baby up, dropped him and killed him. These are the people protecting my children and they can not name one incident happening to my children in my care. None of them had one cavity since the three yrs out of our care my oldest daughter had 7 cavities filled.