Wisconsin Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Case Access

Three Unnamed Petitioners v. Gregory A. Peterson

Appeal Number 2013AP002508 - W

CONSOLIDATED - List of Consolidated Cases Supreme Court

CASE HISTORY

Status	Court	Filing Date	Anticipated Due Date	Activity		
OCCD	SC	03-28-2019	Due Dule	Letter/Correspondence		
	Comm order	ent: Copy of	letter from at	torney Edward Greim to John Doe Judge Kelley with attached proposed		
OCCD	SC	05-23-2018		Remittitur		
	Comm	ent: Case Cl	osed per Apr	il 5, 2018 Order.		
OCCD	SC	04-18-2018		Other Papers		
		ent: Copy of st of intereste		ttorney Wilson to John Doe Judge Kelley re: removal of attorney name		
OCCD	SC	04-17-2018		Other Papers		
		Comment: Copy of letter in response to Feb. 1, 2018 inquiries filed with John Doe Judge Kelley by Attorney Ambrose on behalf of David Robles.				
OCCD	SC	04-06-2018		Other Papers		
		• •	letter, memo orney Chishol	randum, and exhibits filed with John Doe Judge Kelley by Milwaukee m		
OCCD	SC	04-05-2018		Other Papers		
_	Comment: Copy of Brief in Response to February 1, 2018, Inquiries filed with John Doe Judge Kelley by Unnamed Movants 2, 4-7, along with cover letter.					
OCCD	SC	03-30-2018		Letter/Correspondence		
	Comm	Comment: Copy of Letter from Judge Kelley to Attorney Ambrose re: extension briefing deadline				
OCCD	SC	02-22-2018		Motion for Miscellaneous Relief		
	Submi Decisi	By: 23280 (O it Date: 2-22- on: (O) Othe on Date: 4-5-	r	w)		

ORD that the motion of Unnamed Movants' 2-7 for clarification is granted in part, as set forth in this order. The remaining requests for relief in the motion are denied.

FRO that the John Doe judge has full authority, as set forth above, to take all actions to effectuate the mandate of this court, as set forth in this court's July 16, 2015 and December 2, 2015 decisions, including the closure and wind up of those John Doe proceedings, and full authority to address all collateral matters not addressed by this court in its decisions and orders so long as the John Doe judge's actions do not undo or are not inconsistent with this court's July 16, 2015 and December 2, 2015 decisions.

FRO that electronic copies of the records in Milwaukee Cty. Case No. 2012JD23 and Dane Cty. Case No. 2013JD9 are remitted to the clerks of those respective circuit courts. The clerk of this court shall provide the original paper records and an electronic copy of those records to the John Doe judge for his use and disposition in his discretion pursuant to applicable law. The John Doe judge shall have full authority to make decisions regarding access to, and use of, said records.

FRO that the clerk of this court shall transfer to the custody and care of the John Doe judge the John Doe evidence submitted to the clerk pursuant to this court's December 2, 2015 opinion and order. The John Doe judge shall have full authority to make decisions regarding access to, and the disposition of, that evidence. The John Doe judge shall also have full authority to take actions regarding access to, and the disposition of, any John Doe evidence that should have been gathered and submitted pursuant to this court's December 2, 2015 opinion and order, but was not.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, and DANIEL KELLY, J.J., did not participate. Comment: Motion for Clarification of Mandate by Unamed Movants 2-7

OCCD SC 01-29-2018 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Cover letter and index from the Department of Justice concerning evidence DOJ received from Atty Schmitz and the Wisconsin Ethics Commission. Received pursuant to the December 2, 2015 Order of this court. (Cover letter in public file, Index under seal pending determination of the court).

OCCD SC 12-01-2017 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: from Atty Schwarzenbart w/attached index

OCCD SC 12-01-2017 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: from Atty Schwarzenbart

OCCD SC 01-20-2017 Court Order

IT IS ORDERED that the clerk of this court shall place into the public court file the documents identified in Attachment A. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the clerk of this court shall place into the public court file the redacted versions of the documents identified in Attachment B that the court is providing to the clerk of this court with the original of this order. The clerk of this court shall maintain as confidential under seal the original, unredacted versions of the documents identified in Attachment B pending further order of the court.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY and DANIEL KELLY, J.J., did not participate. SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (concurring in part, dissenting in part).

OCCD SC 11-03-2016

Other Papers

Comment: Amended table to Affidavit filed 11/2/16 pursuant to 12/2/15 court order filed by Atty Schmitz (Under seal pending determination of the court). Cover letter (public file)

OCCD SC 11-02-2016 Other Papers

Comment: Affidavit and Index concerning John Doe II Evidence w/ attached table filed by Atty Schmitz

OCCD		02-2016 from J. Abrahamson	Letter/Correspondence with AAG Rice 10/20/2016 letter attached
OCCD		02-2016 October 20, 2016 Let	Letter/Correspondence tter from AAG Rice on behalf of Judge Wambach
OCCD		27-2016 Letter from A.G. Schi	Letter/Correspondence imel re: Appointment of Special Master
OCCD		21-2016 Response to WI Free	Letter/Correspondence edom of Information Council from Clerk
OCCD		20-2016 from WI Freedom of	Letter/Correspondence Information Council re: access to records
OCCD		14-2016 from Unnamed Mova	Letter/Correspondence ant #2 re: 10/13/16 Motion
OCCD	Filed By: 2 Submit Da Decision: 0 Decision D IT IS ORD property a Unnamed ANN WAL SHIRLEY Motion Re Filed By: F Submit Da Comment: Determina	Date: 11-21-2016 ERED that the motion nd for criminal investig Movant No. 2 for post SH BRADLEY, REBE S. ABRAHAMSON, J. sponse Francis Schmitz ite: 10-27-2016 Unnamed Movant No	o of Unnamed Movants Nos. 6 & 7 for immediate supervised return of gation is denied. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of -judgment relief is denied. CCA GRASSL BRADLEY, and DANIEL KELLY, J.J., did not participate. (dissenting).
OCCD	Comment:	ediate Supervised Ret	Letter/Correspondence hmitz re: his intention to respond to "Motion of Unnamed Movants 6 and urn of Property and for Criminal Investigation." [original received
OCCD	Filed By: D	07-2016 Dean Strang Ite: 10-7-2016 (D) Deny	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Decision Date: 11-21-2016

IT IS ORDERED that the motion of Unnamed Movants Nos. 6 & 7 for immediate supervised return of

property and for criminal investigation is denied. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion of Unnamed Movant No. 2 for post-judgment relief is denied. ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, and DANIEL KELLY, J.J., did not participate. SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (dissenting). Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 10-20-2016 Comment: "Motion of Unnamed Movants 6 and 7 for Immediate Supervised Return of Property and for Criminal Investigation." 10/20/2016 Response of Attorney Schmitz - (Under Seal Pending Further Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 09-20-2016 Other Papers

Comment: filing by J. Abrahamson re: Order of September 20, 2016

OCCD SC 09-20-2016 Court Order

IT IS ORDERED that the clerk of this court shall place into the public court file in the three matters identified above the redacted version of "Respondent - Special Prosecutor's Response to Movant No. 2's Notice of Statutory Changes." The original of that document shall continue to be maintained as confidential under seal.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, REBECCA GRASSL BRADLEY, AND DANIEL KELLY, J.J., did not participate.

OCCD SC 04-26-2016

Letter/Correspondence

Comment: From J. Abrahamson to Attorney DeLaquil re: Public Records Request. Copied to Clerk Fremgen and All interested persons, without attachments.

OCCD SC 04-11-2016 Caption Amended

OCCD SC 02-22-2016

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Paul Ferguson Submit Date: 2-22-2016 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 4-11-2016 ORD that the motions are granted. Ann Walsh Bradley and Rebecca G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate. Comment: Motion of Paul M. Ferguson to withdraw as counsel to Ethics and Public Policy Center

OCCD SC 02-22-2016

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: James Troupis Submit Date: 2-22-2016 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 4-11-2016 ORD that the motions are granted. Ann Walsh Bradley and Rebecca G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate. Comment: Motion of James R. Troupis to withdraw as counsel to Ethics and Public Policy Center

OCCD SC 02-22-2016

Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter from U.S. Supreme Court advising of extension of time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari.

OCCD SC 02-08-2016

Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Copy of letter dated 2/8/16 re open records request from J. Abrahamson to Attorney Mark W. DeLaquil and copied to Clerk Fremgen, All Interested Parties and Participating Justices, enclosing copies of letters dated 11/10/15, 11/18/15 and 1/21/16 from Attorney DeLaquil, with responses from Clerk Fremgen dated 11/11/15 and 12/23/15.

OCCD SC 02-05-2016 Other Papers

Comment: Letter from Deputy A.G. Cook to the court

OCCD SC 02-05-2016 Motion to Strike

Filed By: John Chisholm Submit Date: 2-5-2016 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 4-15-2016

ORD that the motion to strike is denied. The court treated the copies it received of letters sent by counsel for Unnamed Movants 2, 7 and 8 to the Attorney General as simply courtesy copies of correspondence. The court did not consider those letters, which did not request any relief or action from the court, to be additional responses to the Intervenor District Attorneys motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders and did not rely on those letters in deciding the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders. The court also did not consider the letter sent by Deputy Attorney General Andrew Cook to be a response to the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders, and it did not rely on that letter in deciding the motion to amend the secrecy orders. Moreover, the court has issued its decision on the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders, and there is no reason to strike those letters as untimely responses to that motion. Finally, the court notes that it does not intend to solicit any further briefing regarding the matters discussed in the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders and the Soluce orders. ANN WALSH BRADLEY AND REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY AND REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate. SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (concurring). Motion Response Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 2-8-2016 Motion Response Filed By: John Chisholm Submit Date: 2-10-2016 Comment: Intervenors' motion to strike 2/1/16 letter from Attorney Strang to Attorney General, letter from Attorney Meyers to Attorney General filed 2/4/16, and letter from Deputy A.G. Cook to the court filed 2/5/16 2/8/15 Unnamed Movant #7's response to motion to strike; 2/10/16 DA's Letter to Withdraw Portion of Motion to Strike Relating to Attorney Edward Meyers

OCCD SC 02-04-2016

Other Papers

Comment: Letter from Attorney Meyers to Attorney General

OCCD SC 02-03-2016 Response

Comment: A reply to the responses may be filed no later than noon on Wednesday, February 3rd.

OCCD SC 02-02-2016

Attorney Change

Comment: Address change for DA Chisholm

OCCD SC 02-01-2016 Other Papers

OCCD SC 02-01-2016 Court Order

ORD that a reply to the responses may be filed no later than noon on Wednesday, February 3, 2016. Ann Walsh Bradley and Rebecca G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate.

OCCD SC 01-27-2016 Court Order

ORD that any responses to the Intervenors' motion to amend the John Doe secrecy orders shall be filed no later than noon on Monday, February 1, 2016.

FRO that the clerk's office shall maintain the original version of the motion under seal pending further order of the court, and shall place the redacted version of the motion into the public court files for the matters identified above.

Ann Walsh Bradley and Rebecca G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate.

OCCD SC 01-25-2016

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: John Chisholm Submit Date: 1-26-2016 Decision: (O) Other Decision Date: 2-5-2016

IT IS ORDERED that the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders to grant access to unredacted portions of the John Doe II records and this courts records to Attorney Brian A. Sutherland, Attorney Kasey J. Curtis, Attorney M. Patrick Yingling, and Ms. Laura Espino of Reed Smith LLP is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders to grant access to unredacted portions of the John Doe II records and this courts records to an unspecified specialist printing company and its employees is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to amend the John Doe II secrecy orders to allow Intervenors, District Attorney John T. Chisholm, District Attorney Ismael R. Ozanne, and District Attorney Larry E. Nelson to file unredacted versions of documents contained in the John Doe II records and this courts records in the United States Supreme Court, provided that the Intervenors seek leave to file such documents under seal in that Court, is granted.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY AND REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate.

SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (concurring in part, dissenting in part).

Motion Response

Filed By: Eric Wilson Submit Date: 2-1-2016 Motion Response Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew) Submit Date: 2-1-2016 Motion Response Filed By: Dennis Coffey Submit Date: 2-1-2016 Motion Response Filed By: John Chisholm Submit Date: 2-3-2016

Comment: Motion of DA's Chisholm, Ozanne and Nelson to Amend Secrecy Orders per 1/27/16 court order the redacted version should be placed in the public files and the original version to remain under seal; 2/1/16: Unnamed Movant #4 & #5 Objection to District Attorneys Motion to Amend John Doe Secrecy Orders. 2/1/16: Unnamed Movant #6's Memorandum in Opposition to Intervenors Motion to Amend the Secrecy Orders. (Filed after deadline) 2/1/16: Unnamed Movant #2, #7 & #8s Memorandum in Opposition to Intervenors Motion to Amend the Secrecy Orders. (Filed after deadline) 2/1/16: Unnamed Movant #2, #7 & #8s Memorandum in Opposition to Intervenors Motion to Amend the Secrecy Orders. (Filed after deadline); 2/3/16 Consolidated Reply to Motion to Amend the Secrecy Orders

OCCD SC 01-25-2016 Response Comment: Response of Attorney Schmitz to Unnamed Movant 6 and 7's Notice of Noncompliance, with redacted Exhibits A and B. OCCD SC 01-14-2016 Letter/Correspondence Comment: Letter from Attorney Schmitz in re Response to 1/13/16 Notice of Noncompliance OCCD SC 01-13-2016 **Other Papers** Comment: Unnamed Movant 6 and 7s' Notice of Noncompliance (filed by Attorney Strang in response to Former Special Prosecutor's 1-5-16 Statement of Compliance OCCD SC 01-05-2016 **Other Papers** Comment: Former Special Prosecutor's Statement of Compliance (filed by Attorney Schmitz in response to December 2, 2015 opinion and order.) OCCD SC 12-21-2015 Other Papers Comment: Statement filed by J. Abrahamson regarding the unsealing of three responses. OCCD SC 12-18-2015 Motion to Intervene Filed By: John Chisholm Submit Date: 12-18-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 1-12-2016 ORD that the motion of Milwaukee County District Attorney John T. Chisholm, Assistant District Attorney Bruce Landgraf, and Assistant District Attorney David Robles for limited intervention is denied; FRO that the motion of Milwaukee County District Attorney John T. Chisholm, Dane County District Attorney Ismael Ozanne, and Iowa County District Attorney Larry E. Nelson to intervene as parties in the three above-referenced proceedings in this court is granted. ANN WALSH BRADLEY and REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J., SEPARATE WRITING CONCURRING IN PART DISSENTING IN PART Comment: Motion of 3 District Attorneys to Intervene as Parties (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 12/18/15 Documents released to public file OCCD SC 12-17-2015 Response Comment: Response of Columbia County District Attorney to December 4, 2015 Court Order (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court). 12/18/15 Documents released to public file OCCD SC 12-11-2015 Response Comment: Response of Dodge County District Attorney to December 4, 2015 Court Order (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court). 12/18/15 Documents released to public file 12-04-2015 OCCD SC Court Order IT IS ORDERED that if any or all of the district attorneys of Columbia, Dane, Dodge, Iowa, and Milwaukee Counties wishes to request permission to intervene as a party for all purposes in the above-referenced matters, such motion or motions for intervention shall be filed with the clerk of this court on or before December 18, 2015.

S. Abrahamson, J. Dissenting. A.W. Bradley and R.G. Bradley, J.J., did not participate.

OCCD		12-02-2015 .W.2d 49	Cites
OCCD		12-02-2015 /is. 2d 351	Cites
OCCD	Judge Opinic Decisi Abrah Order manda shall in impos motior Ann W N. Pat	on: Per Curiam on: Denied Pages: 29 amson, Shirley S. Wrote (Text: ORD that the motio ate of this court is modified mmediately cease acting a ed on him by the court in n for stay is denied, and the Valsh Bradley, J., and Reb	Opinion/Decision ahamson, Bradley, Prosser, Ziegler, Gableman, Bradley Concur/Dissent Opinion 45 pages. n for reconsideration and the motion for stay are denied. FRO that the d and clarified as set forth above. FRO that Attorney Francis Schmitz as special prosecutor, except that he shall perform the specific tasks this opinion. By the Court The motion for reconsideration is denied, the ne mandate is clarified, as described in the opinion. becca G. Bradley, J., did not participate. way while these motions were pending and prior to their final resolution
OCCD	Comm		Letter/Correspondence n to Attorney Greim re: Open Records Request. Copied to Clerk and Participating Justices without attachments.
OCCD		12-01-2015 nent: PDC No: 2015 WI 10	Public Domain Citation
OCCD	Comm	11-19-2015 nent: Unnamed Movant No mination of Court)	Other Papers o. 2's Reply re: Notice of Statutory Changes (Under Seal Pending
OCCD	Comm Chang	ges filed October 28, 2015	Other Papers Schmitz Response to Unnamed Movant No. 2's Notice of Statutory 5 (Original and Proposed Redacted copy filed Under Seal Pending nber 20, 2016 CTO, Redacted copy placed in public file.
OCCD	Comm	10-30-2015 nent: Letter of Francis Sch Pending Determination of	Other Papers mitz re: Unnamed Movant No. 2's Notice of Statutory Changes (Under Court).
OCCD	Comm	10-29-2015 nent: Letter re: 2015 Wis ng Determination of Court	Other Papers Act 64 from John Doe Judge (filed by Attorney Rice) (Under Seal ;)

Comment: Unnamed Movant No. 2's Notice of Statutory Changes (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD	50	10-14-2015	Motion to Intervene				
	Filed By: Jeffrey Fertl Submit Date: 10-14-2015						
	Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 1-12-2016 ORD that the motion of Milwaukee County District Attorney John T. Chisholm, Assistant District Attorney						
	Bruce Landgraf, and Assistant District Attorney David Robles for limited intervention is denied; FRO that the motion of Milwaukee County District Attorney John T. Chisholm, Dane County District Attorney Ismael Ozanne, and Iowa County District Attorney Larry E. Nelson to intervene as parties in the three above-referenced proceedings in this court is granted.						
	ANN WALSH BRADLEY and REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J., SEPARATE WRITING CONCURRING IN PART DISSENTING IN PART Motion Response Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew) Submit Date: 10-22-2015 Motion Response						
	Filed Subr Com 10/22 11/12	By: Jeffrey Fertl nit Date: 11-12-2015 ment: Motion for Lim 2/2015 Response fro	ited Intervention by Prosecutors (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) om Unnamed Movant #2 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court); I Memorandum in Support of Petition for Limited Intervention (Under Seal				
OCCD	SC	09-03-2015	Motion to Intervene				
	Subri Decis ORD ANN N. PA resol SHIR		e denied. and REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate. I., passed away while these motions were pending and prior to their final				

Filed By: Diane Slomowitz Submit Date: 9-11-2015 Comment: Motion for Limited Intervention by Law Enforcement Officer (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 9/11/15: Response of Unnamed Movant #2 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 09-03-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 9/3/15 re open records request from J. Abrahamson to Attorney Greim and copied to Clerk Fremgen, All Interested Parties and Participating Justices, enclosing copies of letters dated 7/31/15 and 8/20/15 from Attorney Greim, with attached cover letter to Clerk.

Submit Date: 8-31-2015 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 12-2-2015 ORD that the motion is denied. ANN WALSH BRADLEY and REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate. N. PATRICK CROOKS, J., passed away while these motions were pending and prior to their final resolution by the court. SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (concurring). Comment: Motion of Unnamed Movant nos. 4 & 5 for Immediate Remand to John Doe Judge and Joinder of Pending Responses (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-26-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/26/15 from J. Abrahamson to Interested Persons and Clerk Fremgen, enclosing copy of letter dated 8/20/2015 from Attorney Greim.

OCCD SC 08-25-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 8-25-2015 Decision: (O) Other Decision Date: 8-26-2015 IT IS ORDERED that, on or before September 2, 2015, Attorney Francis D. Schmitz may file a reply in support of the motion for reconsideration addressing the reply issues he deems appropriate. Bradley, J., did not participate. Comment: Motion to Strike Portion of Response to Motion for Reconsideration or Alternatively to File a Reply Brief (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-20-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/20/15 from J. Abrahamson to Clerk of Court enclosing email correspondence referenced in section VIII of J. Abrahamson letter filed 8/13/15 (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-19-2015

Motion to Intervene

Filed By: Douglas Knott Submit Date: 8-20-2015 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 12-2-2015 ORD that the motions are denied. ANN WALSH BRADLEY and REBECCA G. BRADLEY, J.J., did not participate. N. PATRICK CROOKS, J., passed away while these motions were pending and prior to their final resolution by the court. SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, J. (dissenting). Motion Response Filed By: Diane Slomowitz Submit Date: 8-28-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Timothy Hansen Submit Date: 8-31-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Eric Wilson Submit Date: 8-31-2015 Comment: Motion for Limited Intervention by Investigators (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/28/15: Response of Unnamed Movant #2--joined by Unnamed Movant nos. 7 & 8 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/31/15: Response of Unnamed Movant #3 Joining Response of

Unnamed Movant #2 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/31/15: Response of Unnamed Movant nos. 4 & 5 Joining Response of Unnamed Movant #2 (contained in motion for remand) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-14-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/14/2015 from Attorney Strang to participating justices (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-14-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/13/15 from Special Prosecutor to supreme court (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-13-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Email correspondence dated 8/12/2015 from Judge Nettesheim to CJ Roggensack (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-13-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/12/15 from J. Abrahamson to counsel and other interested parties, enclosing copy of letter dated 7/31/2015 from Attorney Greim, with cover letter to clerk of supreme court.

OCCD SC 08-12-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Email correspondence dated 8/6/2015 from Judge Nettesheim to CJ Roggensack (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-12-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Email correspondence dated 8/5/2015 from Judge Peterson to Attorney Greim (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-12-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Email correspondence dated 8/5/2015 from Attorney Greim to CJ Roggensack (Under Seal Pending Determination of the Court)

OCCD SC 08-11-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/6/15 from Special Prosecutor Schmitz to Clerk of Court. (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-10-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/10/15 from Attorney Strang to CJ Roggensack, with copy of email re: same from Attorney Strang to Judge Peterson, Judge Nettesheim and counsel. (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-10-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/10/15 from Attorney Wilson to CJ Roggensack (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-10-2015

Comment: Letter dated 8/8/15 from Reserve Judge Nettesheim to CJ Roggensack (distributed to participating justices) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-07-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/6/15, from Attorney Strang to Chief Justice Roggensack (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-07-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Email Letter of 8/5/15 from Reserve Judge Peterson to Chief Justice Roggensack and Chief Justice Roggensack's Reply (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-07-2015

Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter dated 8/4/15, from Attorney Greim to CJ Roggensack (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court)

OCCD SC 08-04-2015

Filed By: Francis Schmitz

Motion for Reconsideration

Submit Date: 8-17-2015 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 12-2-2015 PER CURIUM ORD that the motion for reconsideration and the motion for stay are denied. FRO that the mandate of this court is modified and clarified as set forth above. FRO that Attorney Francis Schmitz shall immediately cease acting as special prosecutor, except that he shall perform the specific tasks imposed on him by the court in this opinion. By the Court. - The motion for reconsideration is denied, the motion for stay is denied, and the mandate is clarified, as described in the opinion. Ann Walsh Bradley, J., and Rebecca G. Bradley, J., did not participate. N. Patrick Crooks, J., passed away while these motions were pending and prior to their final resolution by the court. Motion Response Filed By: Edward Greim Submit Date: 8-17-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Michelle Jacobs Submit Date: 8-17-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Eric Wilson Submit Date: 8-17-2015 Motion Response Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew) Submit Date: 8-17-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 9-4-2015 Comment: Special Prosecutor's Motion for Reconsideration and Stay of Decisions and Orders with Memorandum in Support and Cover Letter (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/6/15 -- Letter Response from Attorney Greim (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/13/15-Response of Unnamed Movant #1 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/14/15-Response of Unnamed Movant #4 & #5 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 8/14/15-Response of Unnamed Movants #2, #3, #6, #7 & #8 (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 9/4/15-Reply of Special Prosecutor (unredacted and redacted) (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court) 9/4/15-Corrected Exhibit A to Reply of Special Prosecutor (Under Seal Pending Determination of Court).

OCCD SC 07-29-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Separate writing issued by Prosser, J., explaining basis for order denying motion for his recusal; see order of 7/16/15.

OCCD	SC	07-24-2015	Other Papers
			rom Shirley S. Abrahamson regarding clarification of July 16, 2015 ng rulings on recusal motions.
OCCD		07-16-2015 /is. 2d 1	Cites
OCCD		07-16-2015 .W.2d 165	Cites
OCCD	Before ORD t		Court Order J. non-party amicus briefs and are hereby GRANTED; is Schmitz seeking the recusal of Justice Gableman is hereby DENIED.
OCCD	Before ORD t FRO t Motior	hat the Motion for Recu a at a future date.	Court Order ve to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED; sal is hereby DENIED. A separate writing will more fully respond to the issued by Prosser, J.; see entry of 7/29/15
OCCD	D SC 07-16-2015 Opinion/Decision Judge Panel: Abrahamson, Bradley, Crooks, Prosser, Roggensack, Ziegler, Gableman Opinion: Opinion Decision: Supervisory Writ Denied Pages: 87 Written by: Gableman, Michael J. Abrahamson, Shirley S. Wrote Concur/Dissent Opinion 170 pages. Ziegler, Annette K. Joined Concurring Opinion Ziegler, Annette K. Wrote Concurring Opinion 25 pages. Crooks, N. Patrick Wrote Concurring Opinion 41 pages. Bradley, Ann Walsh Took No Part Prosser, David T. Jr. Wrote Concurring Opinion Roggensack, Patience Drake Joined Concurring Opinion Roggensack, Patience Drake Joined Concurring Opinion Order Text: By the Court.Petition for supervisory writ denied and decision affirmed in Three Unnamed Petitioners. Comment: Roggensack, C.J. (joining Sections IV and V), Ziegler, J. (joining Section IV) and Gablemar J. (joining Section IV)		
		-	

Comment: PDC No: 2015 WI 85

OCCD					
	Comment: filed by Unnamed Movants #4 and #5				
OCCD	SC 05-13-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Redacted Response Briefs Released to Public File				
OCCD	SC 05-13-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Redacted Reply Briefs of Unnamed Movants Released to Public File				
OCCD	SC 05-13-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Redacted First Briefs of Unnamed Movants Released to Public File				
OCCD	SC 05-11-2015 Letter/Correspondence				
	Comment: Clerk's Letter to Parties re: release of documents to the public				
OCCD	SC 05-07-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Letter of Special Prosecutor Regarding Movants' 1, 6 and 7 Revised Redactions and Mootness of Previous Objections (filed by F. Schmitz).				
OCCD	SC 04-30-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Letter of Unnamed Movants Regarding the Special Prosecutor's Corrected Redactions and Mootness of Their Objections (filed by J. Barton).				
OCCD	SC 04-28-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Special Prosecutor's redacted versions of letters originally filed on 3/31/15 and 4/3/15 with cover letter per 4/17/15 order.				
OCCD	SC 04-23-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Unnamed Movants #6's and #7's redacted version of letter filed 4/8/15 and revised redacted version of Petition for Leave to Commence an Original Action Seeking Declaratory Judgment and Other Relief (Sealed per 3/27/15 CTO).				
OCCD	SC 04-23-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Special Prosecutors revised redacted versions of documents, filed in response to Unnamed Movants' Joint Objections to Special Prosecutor's Corrected Redactions (Sealed per 3/27/15 CTO).				
OCCD	SC 04-23-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Unnamed Movant #1's corrected revised redactions of: (1) Responsive Memorandum in Opposition to Special Prosecutor's Petition for Supervisory Writ; (2) Petition to Bypass the Court of Appeals; and (3) Redacted Opening Brief (Sealed per 3/27/15 CTO).				
OCCD	SC 04-20-2015 Other Papers				
	Comment: Redacted version of Special Prosecutors Response in Support of GAB Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief and Opposing Unnamed Movant #2's Opposition to Said Motion. (Sealed per 3/27/15				

OCCD SC 04-17-2015 Other Papers

Comment: New Revised Redacted Respondent Special Prosecutor's Consolidated Response to Redactions of Unnamed Movants; and, Respondent Special Prosecutor's Consolidated Response to Redactions of Unnamed Movants. (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)

OCCD SC 04-17-2015 Court Order

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Unnamed Movant #6, Unnamed Movant #7, and Special Prosecutor Schmitz shall, within seven calendar days, file redacted versions of the above-described filings consistent with the foregoing instructions. The redacted versions shall be subject to the 10-day objection procedure set forth in the courts March 27, 2015 order regarding redactions.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., did not participate.

SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, C.J. (dissenting). I repeat what I wrote in a redaction order issued April 1, 2015: The court continues to direct the parties to redact too much information from their public filings and therefore continues to fail to keep the public adequately informed about the issues and arguments in these John Doe cases. For a full discussion of the reasons for my views, please see my dissents to the three orders issued on March 27, 2015.

OCCD SC 04-16-2015 Other Papers

Comment: CORRECTED Revised Redacted Documents of Unnamed Movant #2 and a Replacement for the Redacted Brief of Unnamed Movant #2. (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)

OCCD SC 04-15-2015 Other Papers

Comment: CORRECTED Revised Redacted Response of Unnamed Movant #1 to Special Prosecutor's Motion for Recusal (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)

OCCD SC 04-13-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Joint Objections of Unnamed Movants to Revised Redacted Filings of the Special Prosecutor pursuant to 3/27/2015 Order (filed by Atty Barton)

OCCD SC 04-08-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Renewal of Objection by Unnamed Movants #6 and #7 to all non-party briefs; SEALED [unredacted] (filed by Attorney Bresnick)

OCCD SC 04-06-2015

Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of the Wyoming Liberty Group

Filed By: Matthew Fernholz Comment: Revised Brief of Wyoming Liberty Group

OCCD SC 04-06-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Letter Statement Submission of Unnamed Movant #3 Regarding Release or Redaction of Previously Filed Documents

OCCD SC 04-06-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Letter and Statement of Unnamed Movant #3 Regarding Release or Redaction of Briefs

OCCD	Comr		Other Papers bmission of Unnamed Movant #8 Regarding Revised Redacted Unsealing of Previously Filed Documents			
OCCD	Comr	04-06-2015 nent: Certificate of Service Documents	Other Papers from Movant #8 Regarding Revised Redacted Brief and Previously			
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted First Brief of Unnamed Movant #8			
		By: Jeffrey Morgan nent: Revised Redacted B	rief of Unnamed Movant #8 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)			
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Other Papers			
		Comment: Letter Statement Submission of Unnamed Movants #6 and #7 Regarding Revised Redacted Documents Previously Filed or Unsealing of Previously Filed Documents				
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #7			
	Filed By: Dean Strang Comment: Revised Redacted Brief of Unnamed Movant #7 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)					
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted First Brief of Unnamed Movant #7			
		By: Dean Strang nent: Revised Redacted R	Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #7 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)			
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #6			
_		By: Dennis Coffey nent: Revised Redacted R	eply Brief of Unnamed Movant #6 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)			
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted First Brief of Unnamed Movant #6			
	Filed By: Dennis Coffey Comment: Revised Redacted Brief of Unnamed Movant #6 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)					
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Other Papers			
		Comment: Letter Statement Submission of Unnamed Movants #4 and #5 Regarding Revised Redacted Documents Previously Filed or Unsealing of Previously Filed Documents				
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movants #4 & #5			
		By: Eric Wilson nent: Revised Redacted R	Reply Brief of Unnamed Movants #4 and #5 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)			

OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted First Brief of Unnamed Movants #4 & #5
		By: Eric Wilson nent: Revised Redacted B	rief of Unnamed Movants #4 and #5 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted First Brief of Unnamed Movant #3
		By: James Barton nent: Revised Redacted B	rief of Unnamed Movant #3 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Other Papers
			bmission of Unnamed Movant #2 Regarding Revised Redacted Unsealing of Previously Filed Documents
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #2
		By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthe nent: Revised Redacted R	ew) eply Brief of Unnamed Movant #2 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-06-2015	First Brief-Supreme Court Corrected Redacted First Brief Unnamed Movant #2
		By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthe nent: Revised Redacted B	ew) rief of Unnamed Movant #2 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Other Papers
		· · ·	I Prosecutor in Support of GAB Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief at #2's Opposition to Said Motion w/ cover letter from Atty Schmitz.
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Separate Appendix
_		By: Francis Schmitz nent: Revised Redacted A	ppendix (Vol I and II) of Special Prosecutor (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Response Brief-Supreme Court Corrected Redacted Response Brief of Special Prosecutor
		By: Francis Schmitz nent: Revised Redacted R	esponse Brief of Special Prosecutor (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Response Brief-Supreme Court
		By: Francis Schmitz nent: Corrected Original R	esponse Brief of Special Prosecutor (SEALED)
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Revised Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #1
		By: Steven Biskupic nent: Revised Redacted R	eply Brief of Unnamed Movant #1 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)

Comment: Revised Redacted Brief of Unnamed Movant #1 (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)

OCCD		04-03-2015	Other Papers		
			nt Submission of Special Prosecutor Regarding Revised Redacted ed (SEALED per 3/27/15 CTO)		
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Other Papers		
	Ethic		ted Documents of Special Prosecutor: Motion for Recusal and Notice of to SCR 60.03 and 60.04; Affidavit of the Special Prosecutor (SEALED per		
OCCD	SC	04-03-2015	Other Papers		
			nt of Unnamed Movant #1 Regarding Release of Revised Redacted ed or Unsealing of Previously Filed Documents.		
OCCD	SC	03-31-2015	Letter/Correspondence		
	Comment: Letter Response of Special Prosecutor to Unnamed Movant #2 and Unnamed Movants 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 Letters re: Oral Argument (sealed per 12/16/14 CTO).				
OCCD	SC	03-30-2015	Other Papers		
	Comment: Letter Statement of John Doe Judge and Chief Judges Regarding Release or Redaction of Documents. (filed by Attorney Rice)				
OCCD	SC	03-27-2015	Court Order		
	subm BRAI ABR/				
OCCD	SC	03-27-2015	Court Order		
			pecial prosecutor to the redacted versions of unnamed movants' nd FRO the objection of Unnamed Movants ##1, 6, and 7 to redacted version		

of special prosecutor's recusal motion is granted; and FRO the motion of Unnamed Movants ##4 and 5 to file a superseding brief is denied, they shall file a redacted version; and FRO on or before April 6, 2015, for all briefs and other filings under seal, parties must file either a written statement or revised redacted version complying with John Doe secrecy orders (as outlined in written order). All parties shall have 10 calendar days after filing to file a written objection (outlined in written order); and FRO any redacted version of a document for which a revised redacted version is filed, the clerk of this court shall maintain the first redacted version under seal pending further order of this court (outlined in written order); and FRO all future briefs and other documents that are filed in this proceeding, the filing party

BRADLEY, J., did not participate. ABRAHAMSON, C.J., dissenting.

OCCD SC 03-25-2015

shall comply with the provisions of the December 16, 2014 order.

Comment: Unnamed Movant #3's Adoption of the Objections of Unnamed Movant #1 to Redactions in Special Prosecutor's Response Brief and Appendices filed 3/5/15 (filed by Atty Barton)

OCCD	SC	03-25-2015	Other Papers				
	Prose		3 Adoption of Ojections of Unnamed Movant #1 to Redactions in Special ad Appendices filed 3/5/15, and Additional Proposed Redactions of by Atty Morgan)				
OCCD	SC	03-25-2015	Letter/Correspondence				
	Comn	nent: re: Oral Argument fro	om Unnamed Movant #2 (filed by Atty O'Neill) - SEALED				
OCCD	SC	03-25-2015	Other Papers				
			ed Movants #6 & #7 to Redactions in Special Prosecutor's Response I5 (filed by Atty O'Beirne) - Redacted				
OCCD	SC	03-25-2015	Other Papers				
			ed Movants #6 & #7 to Redactions in Special Prosecutor's Response I5 (filed by Atty O'Beirne) - Original [unredacted] SEALED				
OCCD	SC	03-24-2015	Letter/Correspondence				
		Comment: Letter re: Oral Argument from Unnamed Movants Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 (filed by Atty Strang) - Original [unredacted] SEALED					
OCCD	SC	03-24-2015	Letter/Correspondence				
		nent: Letter re: Oral Argun g) - Redacted - Sealed pe	nent from Unnamed Movants Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 (filed by Atty r 12-16-14 CTO				
OCCD	SC	03-20-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of the James Madison Center for Free Speech				
_		By: Michael Dean nent: James Madison Cen	iter for Free Speech				
OCCD	SC	03-20-2015	Other Papers				
		nent: Objections of Unnan ppendices filed March 5, 2	ned Movant #1 to Redactions in Special Prosecutor's Response Brief 2015 (SEALED)				
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of the Ethics and Public Policy Center				
		Filed By: James Troupis Comment: Ethics and Public Policy Center					
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of Former Members of the Federal Election Commission				
		By: James Troupis nent: Former Members of	the Federal Election Commission				

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Other Papers

Comment: Fax letter clarification of motions for Pro Hac Vice of Attorney James Bopp, Jr. representing two separate clients - filed by Atty Dean.

OCCD SC 03-19-2015 Certificate of Service

Comment: Certificate of Service of Motion to file Amicus Brief by Madison Center filed by Atty Dean

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief

Filed By: Michael Dean Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 ORD that the motions for leave to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Comment: Motion for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae by the James Madison Center for Free Speach ("Madison Center")

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Michael Dean Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 Granted by the court's opinion and orders of July 16, 2015.

Comment: Motion by Attorney Michael Dean for Admission of Attorney James Bopp, Jr., Pro Hac Vice, Proposed Order Granting Motion for Admission of Attorney James Bopp, Jr. Pro Hac Vice, Cover letter to Office of Lawyer Regulation, Application of Non-Resident Attorney James Bopp, Jr. for Admission Pro Hac Vice

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Certificate of Service

Comment: filed by the Amicus Curiae Wyoming Liberty Group

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Matthew Fernholz Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 Granted by the court's opinion and orders of July 16, 2015. Comment: Motion by Attorney Matthew M. Fernholz for Admission of Attorney Stephen R. Klein, Pro Hac Vice, Affidavit of Attorney Stephen R. Klein, Cover letter to Office of Lawyer Regulation, Application of Attorney Stephen R. Klein for Admission Pro Hac Vice, Proposed Order for Pro Hac Vice Admission of Stephen R. Klein.

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Matthew Fernholz Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 Granted by the court's opinion and orders of July 16, 2015. Comment: Motion by Attorney Matthew M. Fernholz for Admission of Attorney Benjamin Barr, Pro Hac Vice, Affidavit of Attorney Benjamin Barr, Cover letter to Office of Lawyer Regulation, Application of Attorney Benjamin Barr for Admission Pro Hac Vice, Proposed Order for Pro Hac Vice Admission of Benjamin T. Barr.

OCCD	Filed Subm Decis Decis ORD Motio Filed Subm Comr	n Response By: Matthew Fernholz nit Date: 4-7-2015	Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. ing Liberty Group 4/6/15 - Request to File Revised Amicus Brief of
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Other Papers
	to the	lack of redactions set fort	3 adoption letter by reference the arguments, authorities and objections h in the Objections of Unnamed Movant #1 to Redactions in Special nd February 26, 2015 Statement.
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court
		By: Eric Wilson nent: Reply of Unnamed N	Novants #4 and #5 - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court
		By: James Barton nent: Reply of Unnamed N	Novant #3 - Original [unredacted brief] - SEALED
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #3 REDACTED
		By: James Barton nent: Reply of Unnamed N	Novant #3 - Redacted Brief - Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court
		By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthe nent: Reply of Unnamed N	ew) /lovant #2 - Original [unredacted brief] - SEALED
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court
		By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthe nent: Reply of Unnamed N	ew) /lovant #2 - Redacted Brief - Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Letter Notice of Appa by Special Prosecutor Sch	arent Violation of Supreme Court Order and John Doe Secrecy Order mitz
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Cover Letter Enclosi ecy Order filed by Special I	ng Notice of Apparent Violation of Supreme Court Order and John Doe Prosecutor Schmitz

OCCD SC 03-19-2015 Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief Filed By: James Troupis Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 ORD that the motions for leave to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Comment: Motion of the Ethics and Public Policy Center OCCD SC 03-19-2015 Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Nathan Judnic Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (O) Other Decision Date: 3-27-2015 Resolved by order of 3-27-15 re: redaction. Comment: Motion to File GAB Amicus Curiae Brief Under Seal. Resolved by order of 3-27-15 re: redaction.

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief

Filed By: Nathan Judnic Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 ORD that the motions for leave to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Motion Response Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew) Submit Date: 3-25-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 4-6-2015 Comment: Motion of Wisconsin Government Accountability Board 3/25/15: Response of Unnamed Movant #2 (SEALED) 4/3/15 Special Prosecutor's Response in Support of GAB Amicus Motion (SEALED per 3-27-15 CTO)

OCCD SC 03-19-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Unnamed Movant #8's adoption letter of the Original Response Brief of Unnamed Movant #6 and #7 to Special Prosecutor's Objections Regarding Redactions; Unnamed Movant #1's Statement Regarding Redactions for Previously Fled Documents; Proposed Redactions for Unnamed Movant #1's Petition to Bypass the Court of Appeals; and Proposed Redactions for Unnamed Movant #1's Response of Unnamed Movant #1. (Filed by Attorney Jeffrey Morgan)

OCCD SC 03-19-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Unnamed Movant #8's adoption letter of the Original Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #1; the Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #1; the Original Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #2; the Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #2; the Original Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #4 and #5; Original Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #7; and the Redacted Reply Brief of Unnamed Movant #7. (Filed by Attorney Jeffrey Morgan)

OCCD SC 03-19-2015

Reply Brief-Supreme Court

Filed By: Dean Strang Comment: Reply of Unnamed Movant #7 - Original [unredacted brief] - SEALED

OCCD		03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court			
		By: Dennis Coffey nent: Reply of Unnamed M	Iovant #6 - Original [unredacted brief] - SEALED			
OCCD		03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court			
		By: Dennis Coffey nent: Reply of Unnamed M	Novant #6 - Redacted Brief - Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO			
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court			
		By: Dean Strang nent: Reply of Unnamed M	Novant #7 - Redacted Brief - Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO			
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Other Papers			
			ned Movant #1 to Redactions in Special Prosecutor's Previously Filed 015 Statement SEALED (Filed by Attorney Michelle Jacobs)			
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court			
		Filed By: Michelle Jacobs Comment: Reply of Unnamed Movant #1 - Redacted Brief - Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO				
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief			
	Filed By: James Troupis Submit Date: 3-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015					
	Comn	nent: Motion of Former Fe	to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. deral Election Commission Members Lee Ann Elliott, David Mason, I Wold for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae			
OCCD	SC	03-19-2015	Reply Brief-Supreme Court			
		By: Michelle Jacobs nent: Reply of Unnamed M	lovant #1 - Original [unredacted brief] - SEALED			
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of the Hon. Bradley A. Smith, Center for Competitive Politics, and Wisconsin Family Action			
		By: Richard Esenberg nent: Hon. Bradley A. Smit	th, Center for Competitive Politics, AND Wisconsin Family Action			
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief			
	Subm Decis Decis Grant Comn		and orders of July 16, 2015. erguson for Admission of Adam J. White Pro Hac Vice; Copy of White			

OCCD	Filed Subm Decis Decis ORD Comn		Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. ey A. Smith, Center for Competitive Politics and Wisconsin Family
	Action		
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Other Papers
	Reda	ctions in Special Prosecute	Novants #6 and #7 adopting the Objections of Unnamed Movant #1 to or's Previous Filings and February 26, 2015 Statement, which is dated ed by Attorney Dean Strang)
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Proof of Service in C Party Briefs (Filed by Attor	over Letter to Unnamed Movants #6 and #7 Opposition to ALL ney Dean Strang)
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Opposition of Unnam by Attorney Dean Strang)	ned Movants #6 and #7 to ALL Non-Party Briefs; SEALED [unredacted]
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Opposition of Unnam 2-16-14 CTO (Filed by Atto	ned Movants #6 and #7 to ALL Non-Party Briefs - Redacted; SEALED orney Dean Strang)
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Affidavit of Mailing of by Attorney Dennis Coffe	f Pro Hac Vice Motion for Attorneys Cipollone, Gilmore and Nettescheim y)
OCCD	SC	03-18-2015	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief
	Subm Decis Decis Grant Comm Gilmo	nent: Motion by Attorney D	and orders of July 16, 2015. Dennis Coffey for Admission of Attorneys Pat A. Cipollone, Robert eim Pro Hac Vice; Copies of Applications for Pro Hac Vice of Cipollone,
OCCD	SC	03-17-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of Campaign Legal Center, Democracy 21, Common Cause in Wisconsin and League of Women Voters of Wisconsin
	Comn	By: Susan Crawford nent: Campaign Legal Cer en Voters of Wisconsin	nter, Democracy 21, Common Cause in Wisconsin and League of

OCCD SC 03-17-2015

Comment: Correspondence from Attorney Eric Wilson re: Wisconsin Eye Coverage and Proposal in Joint Report on Oral Argument

OCCD	Filed Subm Decis Decis ORD Comr	ment: Motion of Campaign	Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Legal Center, Democracy 21, Common Cause in Wisconsin and League for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae
OCCD	SC	03-16-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of Citizens for Responsible Government Advocates, Inc.
		By: Christopher Meuler nent: Citizens for Respons	ible Government Advocates, Inc.
OCCD	SC	03-16-2015	Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief
	Subr Decis Decis ORD Comr		to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. r Responsible Government Advocates, Inc. for Leave to File Brief
OCCD	SC	03-13-2015	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief
	Subr Decis Decis ORD before prose courts	e April 6, 2015. FRO that a cutor shall serve and file a	and the special prosecutor shall serve and file his corrected brief on or long with the corrected original (unredacted) response brief, the special redacted version of the corrected response brief that complies with the regarding objections to proposed redactions.
	Comr (SEA	•	Motion to File a Corrected Response Brief w/ Exhibit 1 attached
OCCD	SC	03-13-2015	Other Papers
		nent: Respondent Judges' (SEALED)	Objection to Paragraph 3 of the Joint Report; filed by Attorney David
OCCD	SC	03-11-2015	Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.
		By: Michael Dean nent: Wisconsin Right to L	ife, Inc.

OCCD SC 03-11-2015

Other Papers

Comment: Joint Report on Oral Argument with attached proposed order

OCCD	Filed E Submi Decisio	03-11-2015 By: Steven Mandell t Date: 3-11-2015 on: (D) Deny	Motion to Intervene
	IT IS C BRAD ABRAI	on Date: 3-27-2015 DRDERED that the motior LEY, J., did not participate HAMSON, C.J., dissentin ent: of the Journal Sentin	е.
OCCD		03-10-2015 ent: by Attorney Michael	Certificate of Service D. Dean
OCCD	Filed E Submi Decisio Decisio ORD th Comm		Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Right to Life, Inc. (WRTL) for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae - rec'd
OCCD	Filed E Submi Decisio Decisio Grante Comm Propos Office	ent: Motion by Attorney N sed Order Granting Motio	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief and orders of July 16, 2015. Michael Dean for Admission of Attorney Randy Elf, Pro Hac Vice, n for Admission of Attorney Randy Elf Pro Hac Vice, Cover letter to plication of Non-Resident Attorney Randy Elf for Admission Pro Hac hail
OCCD	Filed E Submi Decisio Decisio Grante Comm Propos to Offici	ent: Motion by Attorney N sed Order Granting Motio	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief and orders of July 16, 2015. Aichael Dean for Admission of Attorney James Bopp, Jr., Pro Hac Vice, n for Admission of Attorney James Bopp, Jr. Pro Hac Vice, Cover letter Application of Non-Resident Attorney James Bopp, Jr. for Admission Pro with 3/11/15 mail
OCCD	Filed E	03-05-2015 By: David Rice ent: Gregory Peterson, Je	Separate Appendix effrey Kremers, James Daley, James Duvall, and Gregory Potter -

OCCD	SC	03-05-2015
OCCD	SC	03-05-201

Separate Appendix

Filed By: David Rice

Comment: Gregory Peterson, Jeffrey Kremers, James Daley, James Duvall, and Gregory Potter - Appendix - Original [unredacted] - (SEALED) Appendix of the Respondent Judges REDACTED

OCCD	SC	03-05-2015	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief	
	Subn Decis Decis IT IS only ¹ prose and s that c BRAI ABRA	Volumes I and II, and no ecutors response brief is serve revised redacted o comply with the courts o DLEY, J., did not particip AHAMSON, C.J. dissen		
OCCD		03-05-2015	Separate Appendix	
		By: Francis Schmitz ment: Appendix - Redac	ted - Volumes I and II (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)	
OCCD	SC	03-05-2015	Separate Appendix	
	Com	By: Francis Schmitz ment: Appendix - Origina ecutor (Final) REDACTE	al [unredacted] - Volumes I through IV - (SEALED) Appendix of the Special ED	
OCCD	SC	03-05-2015	Response Brief-Supreme Court	
		By: Francis Schmitz ment: Special Prosecuto	or's Redacted Brief - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)	
OCCD	SC	03-05-2015	Response Brief-Supreme Court	
		By: Francis Schmitz ment: Special Prosecuto	or's Original [unredacted] Brief - (SEALED)	
OCCD	SC	03-05-2015	Response Brief-Supreme Court Response Brief of Judges(released by CTO 3/27/15)	
	Com	By: David Rice ment: Gregory Peterson nal [un-redacted] Brief -	, Jeffrey Kremers, James Daley, James Duvall, and Gregory Potter - (SEALED)	
OCCD	SC	03-04-2015	Response	
	Comment: Response of Unnamed Movant #3 to Special Prosecutor's 2/24/15 Objection to Redactions Proposed in Unnamed Movants' Briefs - Original [unredacted] SEALED			

OCCD SC 03-04-2015 Response

Comment: Response of Unnamed Movants #6 and #7 to Special Prosecutor's 2/24/15 Objection to Redactions Proposed in Unnamed Movants' Briefs - Original [unredacted] SEALED

OCCD SC 03-04-2015 Response

Comment: Response of Unnamed Movant #2 to Special Prosecutor's 2/24/15 Objection to Redactions Proposed in Unnamed Movants' Briefs - Original [unredacted] SEALED

OCCD SC 03-04-2015 Court Order

IT IS ORDERED that, on or before March 11, 2015, the parties shall meet and confer (whether in person, telephonically, or otherwise) and shall file a joint written report regarding the manner in which oral argument in these matters should be conducted. The parties are encouraged to reach agreement on as many points as possible and to state in their joint report where they have reached agreement. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement on a particular point, they shall briefly set forth their respective positions and the primary reasons for those positions in the joint report.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the meet and confer and the joint written report shall address (topics outlined in number 1-7 of the written order).

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., did not participate.

PATIENCE DRAKE ROGGENSACK, J., concurs and would have the parties address only those items set forth in the paragraphs numbered 1 and 2 above.

OCCD SC 03-04-2015 Response

Comment: Response of Unnamed Movant #1 to Special Prosecutor's 2/24/15 Objection to Redactions Proposed in Unnamed Movants' Briefs - Original [unredacted] SEALED

OCCD SC 03-02-2015

Brief of Amicus Curiae Amicus Brief of Professors of Legal Ethics

Filed By: Thomas Cannon Comment: Professors of Legal Ethics

OCCD SC 03-02-2015

Motion to File Amicus/Non-Party Brief

Filed By: Thomas Cannon Submit Date: 3-2-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 7-16-2015 ORD that the motions for leave to file nonparty briefs are hereby GRANTED. Comment: Motion of Professors of Legal Ethics for Leave to File Non-Party Brief in Support of Neither Party filed by Thomas R. Cannon

OCCD SC 02-27-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Special Prosecutors Statement Regarding Sealed Documents in Appellate Records-REDACTED SEALED per 12/16/14 CTO

OCCD SC 02-27-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Letter Statement of Unnamed Movants #3 Regarding Release or Redaction of Documents SEALED per 12/16/14 CTO

OCCD SC 02-27-2015 Other Papers

OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Special Prosecutors /14 CTO SEALED ORIGI	Other Papers Statement Regarding Sealed Documents in Appellate Records per NAL
OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Letter Statement of ED per 12/16/14 CTO	Other Papers Unnamed Movant #8 Regarding Release or Redaction of Documents
OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Letter Statement of ments SEALED per 12/16	Other Papers Unnamed Movants #6 & #7 Regarding Release or Redaction of /14 CTO
OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Redacted Version of /14 CTO	Other Papers f Brief of Unnamed Movants #4 & #5 filed SC on 2/2/2015 SEALED per
OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Redacted Version or n SC 2/24/2015 SEALED	Other Papers f Letter Motion of Unnamed Movants #4 & #5 to File a Superseding Brief per 12/16/14 CTO
OCCD	Comr	02-27-2015 nent: Letter Statement of ments SEALED per 12/16	Other Papers Unnamed Movant #4 & #5 Regarding Release of Redaction of 5/14 CTO
OCCD		02-27-2015 nent: Certificate of Service	Certificate of Service e to Redacted Documents filed by Special Prosecutor Schmitz
OCCD		02-27-2015 nent: Cover Letter to Reda	Other Papers acted Documents filed by Special Prosecutor Schmitz
OCCD	Comr		Other Papers 1's Statement Regarding Redactions for Previously Filed Documents LED per CTO 12/16/2014
OCCD	Comr		Response the Motion for Modification filed on February 19, 2015 by Special ance with the court's February 20, 2015 order.
OCCD	IT IS		Court Order onse to the special prosecutor's objection shall be filed by March 4, 2015; D that, pursuant to the terms of this court's December 16, 2014 order,

and IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to the terms of this court's December 16, 2014 order, the redacted versions of the Unnamed Movants' briefs-in-chief shall remain under seal until such time as the court rules on the special prosecutor's objection and issues a written order directing the clerk of

OCCD SC 02-24-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Eric Wilson Submit Date: 2-24-2015 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 3-27-2015

ORD the objection of the special prosecutor to the redacted versions of briefs-in-chief is denied; and FRO the objection of Unnamed Movants ##1, 6, and 7 to redacted version of special prosecutor's recusal motion is granted; and FRO the motion of Unnamed Movants ##4 and 5 to file a superseding brief is denied, they shall file a redacted version; and FRO all briefs and other filings under seal, parties must file redacted version; and FRO on or before April 6, 2015, each party shall either file a written statement or file a revised redacted version (outlined in written order). All parties shall have 10 calendar days after the filing to file a written objection (outlined in written order); and FRO any redacted version of a document for which a revised redacted version is filed, the clerk of this court shall maintain the first redacted version under seal pending further order of this court (outlined in written order); and FRO all future briefs and other documents that are filed in this proceeding, the filing party shall comply with the provisions of the December 16, 2014 order.

BRADLEY, J., did not participate.

ABRAHAMSON, C.J., dissenting.

Comment: Letter Motion of Unnamed Movants #4 & #5 to file a superseding brief to replace initial brief filed on February 2, 2015. SEALED per 12/16/14 CTO

OCCD SC 02-24-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: David Rice Submit Date: 2-24-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 2-25-2015 IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. Therefore, and consistent with this court's December 16, 2014 order, the record for purposes of the proceedings in this court shall be comprised of the record in Milwaukee County Case No. 2012JD23, the record in Dane County Case No. 2013D9, and the orders attached to the motion described herein. Bradley, J., did not participate. Comment: Motion of Gregory Peterson, Jeffrey Kremers, James Daley, James Duvall, and Gregory Potter to Supplement the Record -- Original [unredacted] -- SEALED.

OCCD SC 02-24-2015 Certificate of Service

Comment: Special Prosecutor's Objection to Redacted Documents Pursuant to Order of 12-16-14

OCCD SC 02-24-2015 Other Papers

Comment: Special Prosecutor's Objection to Redacted Documents Pursuant to Order of 12-16-14 - Original [unredacted] SEALED See CTO 2/25/15

OCCD SC 02-23-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: Letter of Special Prosecutor re: Correction to Statutory Citation in Motion for Recusal -Original [unredacted] SEALED

OCCD SC 02-23-2015

First Brief-Supreme Court

Filed By: James Barton

Comment: Revised Redacted Brief of Unnamed Movant #3 to Supercede Redacted Brief Filed 2/2/15 -

OCCD SC 02-19-2015 Certificate of Service

Comment: Unnamed Movant #8's Response to Motion for Recusal

OCCD SC 02-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Jeffrey Morgan Submit Date: 2-19-2015 Decision: (O) Other Decision Date: 3-27-2015 Resolved by order of 3-27-15 re: redaction. Comment: Motion to file under seal the response of Unnamed Movant #8 to the motion for recusal -SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO. Resolved by order of 3-27-15 re: redaction.

OCCD SC 02-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 2-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 2-20-2015

ORD that the motion is granted, and the length of the special prosecutors response brief to be filed in these matters shall not exceed 55,000 words if a proportional font is used; and

FRO that, notwithstanding Wis. Stat. (Rule) 809.14(3), Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and Chief Judges Gregory J. Potter, James P. Daley, James J. Duvall, and Jeffrey A. Kremers must file any response brief(s) in this court on or before March 5, 2015; and that within 10 days of filing the Three Unnamed Petitioners in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W, the Two Unnamed Petitioners in Case No. 2014AP296-OA, and the Unnamed Movants in Case Nos. 2014AP417-421-W (collectively, the Unnamed Movants) must file either a reply brief or a statement that

no reply brief will be filed; and

FRO that the original (unredacted) and the redacted versions of the special prosecutors motion filed on February 19, 2015, shall be maintained under seal by the clerk of this court pending further order of the court; and

FRO that on or before February 25, 2015, the special prosecutor shall file a new version of the redacted copy of his motion, in which the information contained in the parentheticals on page four of the motion shall have been redacted. Upon reviewing the new redacted copy of the brief to ensure that the proper redactions have been made pursuant to this paragraph, the clerk of this court shall place the new redacted version of the special prosecutors motion into the public court files for these matters.

Bradley, J., did not participate.

Comment: Motion for Modification of December 16, 2014 Order as it Relates to the Length of Special Prosecutor's Response Brief - Redacted - SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO

OCCD SC 02-19-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 2-19-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 2-20-2015 ORD that the motion is granted, and the length of the special prosecutors response brief to be filed in these matters shall not exceed 55,000 words if a proportional font is used; and FRO that, notwithstanding Wis. Stat. (Rule) 809.14(3), Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and Chief Judges Gregory J. Potter, James P. Daley, James J. Duvall, and Jeffrey A. Kremers must file any response brief(s) in this court on or before March 5, 2015; and that within 10 days of filing the Three Unnamed Petitioners in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W, the Two Unnamed Petitioners in Case No. 2014AP296-OA, and the Unnamed Movants in Case Nos.

2014AP417-421-W (collectively, the Unnamed Movants) must file either a reply brief or a statement that no reply brief will be filed; and

FRO that the original (unredacted) and the redacted versions of the special prosecutors motion filed on February 19, 2015, shall be maintained under seal by the clerk of this court pending further order of the court; and

FRO that on or before February 25, 2015, the special prosecutor shall file a new version of the redacted copy of his motion, in which the information contained in the parentheticals on page four of the motion shall have been redacted. Upon reviewing the new redacted copy of the brief to ensure that the proper redactions have been made pursuant to this paragraph, the clerk of this court shall place the new redacted version of the special prosecutors motion into the public court files for these matters.

Bradley, J., did not participate.

Comment: Motion for Modification of December 16, 2014 Order as it Relates to the Length of Special Prosecutor's Response Brief - Original [unredacted] SEALED

OCCD SC 02-12-2015 Certificate of Service

Comment: Motion for Recusal and Notice of Ethical Concerns Related to SCR 60.03 and SCR 60.04 (original and redacted versions) and Affidavit of Special Prosecutor Schmitz

OCCD SC 02-12-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 2-12-2015 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 7-16-2015 Per Order of Prosser, J.: FRO that the Motion for Recusal is hereby DENIED. A separate writing will more fully respond to the Motion at a future date. Per order of Gableman, J.: FRO that the motion of Francis Schmitz seeking the recusal of Justice Gableman is hereby DENIED. Motion Response Filed By: Jeffrey Morgan Submit Date: 2-19-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Steven Biskupic Submit Date: 2-20-2015 Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 2-23-2015 Comment: Motion for Recusal and Notice of Ethical Concerns Related to SCR 60.03 and SCR 60.04 and Affidavit of Special Prosecutor - Original [unredacted] - SEALED; 2/19/15 - Response by Unnamed Movant #8- Original [unredacted] - SEALED; 2/20/15 - Response by Unnamed Movant #1 Original [unredacted] - SEALED; 2/23/2015 - Letter from Special Prosecutor Re: Correction to Statutory Citation in Motion - Original [unredacted] SEALED

 OCCD
 SC
 02-11-2015
 Assigned-Oral Argument

 OCCD
 SC
 02-02-2015
 Separate Appendix

 Filed
 By: Eric Wilson
 Comment: Unnamed Movants # 4 and #5 -Joint Appendix - Redacted - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)

OCCD SC 02-02-2015

OCCD	Filed By: Eric Wi	Ison	First Brief-Supreme Court 4 and #5 - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	Filed By: 23280	(O'Neill, Matthew	First Brief-Supreme Court v) - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	Filed By: 23280	(O'Neill, Matthew	First Brief-Supreme Court v) - Redacted Brief - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)
OCCD	Filed By: James	Barton	First Brief-Supreme Court - Redacted Brief - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)
OCCD	Filed By: James	Barton	First Brief-Supreme Court - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	Filed By: Jeffrey	Morgan	First Brief-Supreme Court - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	Filed By: Jeffrey	Morgan	First Brief-Supreme Court - Redacted Brief- (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)
OCCD	Filed By: Steven	Biskupic	First Brief-Supreme Court - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	Filed By: Dennis	Coffey	First Brief-Supreme Court - Redacted Brief - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)
OCCD	Filed By: Dennis	Coffey	First Brief-Supreme Court - Original [un-redacted] Brief - SEALED
OCCD	SC 01-30-20	15	Separate Appendix

OCCD SC 01-30-2015 First Brief-Supreme Court Filed By: Steven Biskupic Comment: Unnamed Movant #1 - Redacted Brief- (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)

OCCD SC 01-30-2015 Separate Appendix

Comment: Unnamed Movants #6 and #7 - Joint Redacted Appendix - (SEALED per 12-16-14 CTO)

OCCD SC 01-30-2015 First Brief-Supreme Court Filed By: Dean Strang Comment: Unnamed Movant #7 - Original [un-redacted] - SEALED

OCCD SC 01-30-2015 First Brief-Supreme Court Filed By: Dean Strang Comment: Unnamed Movant #7 - Redacted Brief - (Sealed per 12-16-14 CTO)

OCCD SC 01-27-2015 Court Order

IT IS ORDERED that the parties are directed to place the case captions and case numbers of all three proceedings identified above on the cover of each brief filed in this court. The clerk of this court shall file each brief in the case file of each of the three proceedings.

ANN WALSH BRADLEY, J., did not participate.

SHIRLEY S. ABRAHAMSON, C.J. (concurring). I do not object to having the case captions and case numbers of all three proceedings on the parties brief covers. I write separately to note that, unfortunately, the court fails to acknowledge that these cases have been consolidated only for purposes of briefing and argument and that they remain separate proceedings in this court. The court sua sponte cannot add parties to any of the proceedings now before this court without proper motions to intervene, responses, and formal orders granting interventionnone of which has occurred. Consequently, regardless of what captions and case numbers are placed on the brief covers, my position is that the parties should still include the following information in all of their briefs:

a) The identity of the individual or entity on whose behalf the brief is being filed;

b) The case name and number of each case in which that individual or entity has previously formally appeared; and

c) What issues that individual or entity is addressing and where those issues were previously raised in that individuals or entitys previous filings in one or more of the three proceedings.

OCCD SC 01-15-2015

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 1-15-2015 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 1-21-2015

ORD that the motion to supplement is denied; and FRO that the sealed document attached to the motion to supplement as Exhibit 1 shall be maintained by the clerk of this court under seal; and FRO that Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitzs motion to seal is granted and his response to the motion to supplement shall be maintained by the clerk of this court under seal; and FRO that a redacted copy of Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitzs response to the motion to supplement shall be filed on or before February 27, 2015, in conformity with the paragraph that spans pages 5-6 of this courts order of December 16, 2014. The parties and this court shall then follow the redaction review/objection procedure set forth in that paragraph of the December 16, 2014 order; and FRO that, notwithstanding

Wis. Stat. (Rule) 809.14(3), the Three Unnamed Petitioners in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W, the Two Unnamed Petitioners in Case No. 2014AP296-OA, and the Unnamed Movants in Case Nos. 2014AP417-421-W (collectively, the Unnamed Movants) must file their opening brief(s) in this court on or before February 2, 2015; that within 30 days of filing Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and Chief Judges Gregory Potter, James Daley, James Duvall and Jeffrey Kremers, must file either a response brief or a statement that no response brief will be filed; and that if a response brief is filed by Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and/or Chief Judges Gregory Potter, James Daley, James Duvall and Jeffrey Kremers, within 10 days of filing the Unnamed Movants must file either a reply brief or a statement that no reply brief will be filed.

Bradley, J., did not participate. Prosser, J., dissents. Comment: Motion to Seal Response to Motion to Supplement filed by Atty Schmitz

OCCD SC 01-12-2015 Court Order

IT IS ORDERED that any response to the motion to supplement the record shall be filed no later than noon on Thursday, January 15, 2015. Bradley, J., did not participate.

OCCD SC 01-08-2015 Letter/Correspondence

Comment: from Clerk to Parties re: Identifying Filings

OCCD SC 01-07-2015 Motion to Correct/Supplement Record

Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew)

Submit Date: 1-8-2015 Decision: (D) Deny

Decision Date: 1-21-2015

ORD that the motion to supplement is denied: and FRO that the sealed document attached to the motion to supplement as Exhibit 1 shall be maintained by the clerk of this court under seal; and FRO that Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitzs motion to seal is granted and his response to the motion to supplement shall be maintained by the clerk of this court under seal; and FRO that a redacted copy of Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitzs response to the motion to supplement shall be filed on or before February 27, 2015, in conformity with the paragraph that spans pages 5-6 of this courts order of December 16, 2014. The parties and this court shall then follow the redaction review/objection procedure set forth in that paragraph of the December 16, 2014 order; and FRO that, notwithstanding Wis. Stat. (Rule) 809.14(3), the Three Unnamed Petitioners in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W, the Two Unnamed Petitioners in Case No. 2014AP296-OA, and the Unnamed Movants in Case Nos. 2014AP417-421-W (collectively, the Unnamed Movants) must file their opening brief(s) in this court on or before February 2, 2015; that within 30 days of filing Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and Chief Judges Gregory Potter, James Daley, James Duvall and Jeffrey Kremers, must file either a response brief or a statement that no response brief will be filed; and that if a response brief is filed by Special Prosecutor Francis A. Schmitz, John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson, and/or Chief Judges Gregory Potter, James Daley, James Duvall and Jeffrey Kremers, within 10 days of filing the Unnamed Movants must file either a reply brief or a statement that no reply brief will be filed.

Bradley, J., did not participate. Prosser, J., dissents.

Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 1-15-2015 Motion Response Filed By: 23280 (O'Neill, Matthew) Submit Date: 1-16-2015 Comment: Motion to Supplement the Record w/ Sealed Exhibit 1 Response to Motion to Supplement w/certificate of service filed by Atty Schmitz (SEALED) Reply brief filed in support of motion to supplement record filed by Atty O'Neill

OCCD SC 01-07-2015

Motion for Clarification

Filed By: James Barton Submit Date: 1-8-2015 Decision: (O) Other Decision Date: 1-13-2015 ORD that each Unnamed Movant shall be permitted to reference and incorporate factual recitations and arguments contained in the briefs of other Unnamed Movants. The Unnamed Movants are encouraged, but not required, to file joint briefs with other Unnamed Movants if possible (i.e., if their factual recitations and arguments are aligned in full with certain other Unnamed Movants). FRO that for each brief-in-chief or reply brief, the parties to these proceedings shall separately file an electronic copy of their original, unredacted brief and an electronic copy of the redacted version of their brief. The electronic copy of the original, unredacted brief shall be uploaded to the courts e-filing website as a text-searchable PDF file. The electronic copy of the redacted version of the brief shall be separately uploaded to the courts e-filing website as a PDF image (i.e., a PDF file that is not text-searchable). Each version of the brief--in both hard copy and electronic copy--shall state on the brief cover whether it is ORIGINAL (i.e., unredacted) or REDACTED. The electronic copy of the original, unredacted brief will be maintained under seal by the clerk of this court. The electronic copy of the redacted version of the brief will be subject to the same procedure used for hard copies of the redacted versions of the briefs, as set forth in the second full paragraph on page 5 of the courts December 16, 2014 order. If no objection to the redacted version is received pursuant to that procedure, at the same time that the clerk of this court places the hard copy of the redacted version of the brief into the public court file, the clerk of this court will also permit access to the electronic copy of the redacted version of the brief.

Bradley, J., did not participate.

Comment: of 12/16/14 court order - w/ affidavit of service

OCCD SC 12-19-2014 Court Order

ORD that counsel are advised that they should keep open on their calendars both April 17, 2015, and the afternoon of April 20, 2015. This instruction should not be interpreted as meaning that the court will definitely hear oral argument on both of those days, but at this point the court simply wants all counsel to keep those dates available for oral argument in these matters. The court will advise counsel at a later date whether the court will hold oral argument on one or both of those dates, as well as other specifics regarding oral argument, including whether the court desires that counsel address the issues presented in these matters in a particular order. Bradley, J., did not participate.

 OCCD
 SC
 12-16-2014
 Court Changed to Supreme Court

 OCCD
 CA
 08-15-2014
 Certificate of Service

 Comment: Motion to Seal Response to Supplemental Filing to PRE and the Reply to Supplemental Filing on PRE
 Supplemental Filing to PRE and the Reply to Supplemental Filing to PRE and the Reply to Supplemental Filing to PRE

 OCCD
 SC
 08-15-2014
 Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

 Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 8-15-2014
 Submit Date: 8-15-2014
 Submit Date: 8-15-2014

OCCD	CA 07-14-2014	Certificate of Service			
	Comment: Motion to Seal Response to Supplemental Filing to PRE and the Response to Supplemental Filing on PRE				
OCCD	Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 7-14-2014 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 12-16-2014	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief of December 16, 2014 court order.			
	Comment: Motion to Seal Res	sponse to Supplemental Filing to PRE			
OCCD	SC 06-25-2014 Comment: Supplemental Filin	Certificate of Service Ig to PRE and Motion to Seal			
OCCD	Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 6-25-2014 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 12-16-2014	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief of December 16, 2014 court order. oplemental filing to PRE			
OCCD	SC 03-19-2014 Comment: Letter from J. Brad	Letter/Correspondence lley to counsel re: recusal.			
OCCD	Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 3-5-2014 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 12-16-2014	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief of December 16, 2014 court order. esponse and Affidavit to PRE)			
OCCD	Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-25-2014 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 3-7-2014 ORD that the motion for recor	Motion for Reconsideration nsideration is denied. FRO that all additional correspondence from shall be placed in this court's correspondence file without response. I motion decision			
	SC 02-24-2014	Motion for Miscellaneous Relief			

Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-25-2014 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 3-19-2014 ORD that the motion to intervene is denied in its entirety. Abrahamson, C.J., did not participate regarding this motion. Bradley, J., did not participate. Comment: motion to intervene on PRE - filed with CA motion to reconsider 2/13/14 decision

OCCD SC 02-20-2014 Fee Paid

Comment: Receipt No: 14R 000492

OCCD SC 02-19-2014

Petition for Review

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 2-19-2014 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 12-16-2014

ORD the petition for review is granted; the petitions in Case Nos. 2014AP417-421-W are granted and this court assumes jurisdiction over that action; and the petition in Case No. 2014AP296-OA is granted and this court assumes jurisdiction over that action. These three proceedings shall be consolidated for purposes of briefing and oral argument in this court; and FRO the parties briefs shall address the issues outlined in written order; and FRO briefing set at 40/30/10 as outlined in written order; and FRO the portions of the briefs are outlined in written order; and FRO the parties shall file their respective briefs as outlined in written order; and FRO the clerk shall continue to maintain as sealed all documents previously filed under seal; and FRO on or before February 27, 2015, each party either file a written statement that the document may be placed into the public court file or file a redacted version of the document. Service and objections are outlined in written order: and FRO any brief filed in this court the parties shall not incorporate by reference any portion of any document filed either in the court of appeals or in this court; instead, any material in these documents upon which there is reliance should be restated in the brief filed in this court; and FRO the first brief filed in this court must contain, as part of the appendix, a copy of the decision of the court of appeals in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W and the relevant written decisions and orders of the John Doe Judge; and FRO within 30 days after the date of this order, each party must provide the clerk with 10 copies of the brief previously filed; and FRO within 15 days the clerk of the Milwaukee County circuit court shall assemble the record in Case No. 2012JD23, as outlined in written order. Within 15 days the clerk of the Dane County circuit court shall assemble the record in Case No. 2013JD9, as outlined in written order. The clerks of each circuit court shall submit the lists to John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson for his review and for his approval. Within 20 days, the final version of the lists and the assembled records shall be transmitted to the clerk of this court, as outlined in written order. Upon approval by Judge Peterson, each clerk of the circuit court shall send a copy of that clerk's list to the persons listed on this order. The record in Milwaukee County Case No. 2012JD23 and the record in Dane County Case No. 2013D9 shall constitute the record for purposes of these proceedings in this court; and FRO the allowance of costs, if any, in connection with the granting of the petition will abide the decision of this court on review; and FRO the motion to add five individuals as additional respondents in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W is denied; and FRO the parties will be notified of the date, the time, and the procedures for oral argument in these matters in due course. BRADLEY, J. did not participate. ABRAHAMSON, CJ and PROSSER, J. concurring. Motion Response Filed By: David Rice Submit Date: 2-27-2014 Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 3-5-2014 Motion Response Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 6-25-2014

Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 7-15-2014 Motion Response Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 8-15-2014 Comment: FILED UNDER SEAL Ltr response from Atty Rice, not sealed Response and Affidavit of Special Prosecutor (SEALED) 6/25/14 - Supplemental Filing to PRE (SEALED) 7/14/14 Response to Supplemental Filing to PRE (SEALED) 8/15/14 - Response to Supplemental Filing to PRE (SEALED)

OCCD SC 02-19-2014

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 2-19-2014 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 12-16-2014 Granted subject to provisions of December 16, 2014 court order. Comment: Motion to Seal Petition for Review and Appendix

OCCD SC 02-19-2014

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 2-19-2014 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 12-16-2014

ORD the petition for review is granted; the petitions in Case Nos. 2014AP417-421-W are granted and this court assumes jurisdiction over that action; and the petition in Case No. 2014AP296-OA is granted and this court assumes jurisdiction over that action. These three proceedings shall be consolidated for purposes of briefing and oral argument in this court; and

FRO the parties briefs shall address the issues outlined in written order; and FRO briefing set at 40/30/10 as outlined in written order; and FRO the portions of the briefs are outlined in written order; and FRO the parties shall file their respective briefs as outlined in written order; and FRO the clerk shall continue to maintain as sealed all previously filed documents; and FRO on or before February 27, 2015, each party either file a written statement that the document may be placed into the public court file or file a redacted version of the document. Service and objections are outlined in written order; and FRO any brief filed in this court the parties shall not incorporate by reference any portion of any document filed either in the court of appeals or in this court; instead, any material in these documents upon which there is reliance should be restated in the brief filed in this court; and FRO the first brief filed in this court must contain, as part of the appendix, a copy of the decision of the court of appeals in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W and the relevant written decisions and orders of the John Doe Judge; and FRO within 30 days after the date of this order, each party must provide the clerk with 10 copies of the brief previously filed; and FRO within 15 days the clerk of the Milwaukee County circuit court shall assemble the record in Case No. 2012JD23, as outlined in written order. Within 15 days the clerk of the Dane County circuit court shall assemble the record in Case No. 2013JD9, as outlined in written order. The clerks of each circuit court shall submit the lists to John Doe Judge Gregory A. Peterson for his review and for his approval. Within 20 days, the final version of the and the assembled records shall be transmitted to the clerk of this court, as outlined in written order. Upon approval by Judge Peterson, each clerk of the circuit court shall send a copy of that clerk's list to the persons listed on this order. The record in Milwaukee County Case No. 2012JD23 and the record in Dane County Case No. 2013D9 shall constitute the record for purposes of these proceedings in this court; and FRO the allowance of costs, if any, in connection with the granting of the petition will abide the decision of this court on review; and FRO the motion to add five individuals as additional respondents in Case Nos. 2013AP2504-2508-W is denied; and FRO the parties will be notified of the date, the time, and the procedures for oral argument in these matters in due course. BRADLEY, J. did not participate. ABRAHAMSON, CJ and PROSSER, J. concurring.

Comment: Petitioners' Motion to Add Five Respondents

OCCD CA 02-17-2014 Motion for Reconsideration Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-17-2014 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 2-18-2014 ORD that the motion for reconsideration is denied.

OCCD CA 02-04-2014

Motion to Intervene

Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-4-2014 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 2-13-2014 ORD that the motion for intervention is denied. Motion Response Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-5-2014 Motion Response Filed By: (O'Grady, Michael) Submit Date: 2-10-2014

OCCD CA 02-03-2014 Response

Comment: Redacted Affidavits of Schmitz and Chisolm in Support of the Response of the Special Prosecutor

OCCD CA 01-30-2014 Opinion/Decision

Judge Panel: Blanchard, Lundsten, Kloppenburg

Opinion: Memo Opinion

Decision: Supervisory Writ Denied Pages: 9

Order Text: ORD that the motion to certify this matter to the Wisconsin Supreme Court is denied. FRO that the consolidated petitions for a supervisory writ are denied.

FRO that the special prosecutor shall file and serve a redacted copy of the affidavits and materials accompanying his response, consistent with this order.

FRO that the clerk of this court shall place the following documents under seal in a manila envelope: (1) the petition for a supervisory writ; (2) the affidavit supporting the writ petition; (3) Exhibit 1 to the writ petition; (4) the affidavits and exhibits accompanying the Special Prosecutors response; and (5) the petitioners supplemental filing and attachments related to an order issued by the John Doe judge while this matter has been pending. All other documents, including the redacted materials from the special prosecutor once they are filed, may be placed in a correspondence file open to public inspection.

OCCD CA 01-09-2014

Attorney Change

Comment: Firm/Address change for Atty Strang

OCCD CA 12-27-2013

Certificate of Service

Comment: reply and mtn to seal/unseal

OCCD CA 12-26-2013

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 12-26-2013 Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Decision: (D) Deny

Decision Date: 1-30-2014

ORD that the motion to certify this matter to the Wisconsin Supreme Court is denied.

FRO that the consolidated petitions for a supervisory writ are denied.

FRO that the special prosecutor shall file and serve a redacted copy of the affidavits and materials accompanying his response, consistent with this order.

FRO that the clerk of this court shall place the following documents under seal in a manila envelope: (1) the petition for a supervisory writ; (2) the affidavit supporting the writ petition; (3) Exhibit 1 to the writ petition; (4) the affidavits and exhibits accompanying the Special Prosecutors response; and (5) the petitioners supplemental filing and attachments related to an order issued by the John Doe judge while this matter has been pending. All other documents, including the redacted materials from the special prosecutor once they are filed, may be placed in a correspondence file open to public inspection.

Comment: Motion regarding redaction, disclosure of respondents' filings, and request for short reply

OCCD CA 12-26-2013 Certificate of Service

Comment: Mtn for redaction disclosure and request for reply

OCCD CA 12-26-2013 Certificate of Service

Comment: motion to file reply brief

OCCD CA 12-26-2013

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 12-26-2013 Decision: (D) Deny

Decision Date: 1-30-2014

ORD that the motion to certify this matter to the Wisconsin Supreme Court is denied.

FRO that the consolidated petitions for a supervisory writ are denied.

FRO that the special prosecutor shall file and serve a redacted copy of the affidavits and materials accompanying his response, consistent with this order.

FRO that the clerk of this court shall place the following documents under seal in a manila envelope: (1) the petition for a supervisory writ; (2) the affidavit supporting the writ petition; (3) Exhibit 1 to the writ petition; (4) the affidavits and exhibits accompanying the Special Prosecutors response; and (5) the petitioners supplemental filing and attachments related to an order issued by the John Doe judge while this matter has been pending. All other documents, including the redacted materials from the special prosecutor once they are filed, may be placed in a correspondence file open to public inspection.

Comment: motion to file reply brief w/ affidavit of Dean Strang

OCCD CA 11-27-2013 Attorney Change

Comment: Attorney David C. Rice for Hon. Gregory Peterson, Hon. Jeffrey Kremers, Hon. Gregory Potter, Hon. James Daley and Hon. James Duval. Intent to file joint response on their behalf, separate from any response filed by the Special Prosecutor.

OCCD		11-22-2013 nent: [2013AP002504, 201	Consolidated Case 3AP002505, 2013AP002506, 2013AP002507, 2013AP002508]
OCCD	СА	11-19-2013	Transfer to District IV
OCCD	CA	11-18-2013	Caption Amended

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 11-22-2013

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

ORD that the mtn to consolidate these matters into a single writ proceeding and to waive all but one of the filing fees is granted. FRO that the mtn to file the writ petn under seal is granted and the mtn to exempt the memo in supp of the pet from the seal is denied, for such time as the underlying JD investigations are still pending and any relevant secrecy orders issued by the JD judge(s) are still in eff, or until fro of this crt following an in camera insp of any docs any party asks this crt to order to remain under seal. FRO that the mtn to stay all further proceedings in the underlying JD invest is denied at this time. Proceedings may cont in any or all of these matters unless and until this crt ords otherwise. FRO that the req in the writ pet for orders prohibiting any reserve judge to serve as the JD judge and prohibiting either a JD judge or a spec pros from using a p.o. box for the delivery of documents related to the investigations are denied, and no resp are reg on those issues. FRO that the JD judge and spec pros must respond to the four remaining issues in the writ pet and the mtns to seal and unseal various docs. At a min, they should address: (1) both the factual basis and legal authority for the assignment of a single reserve judge to handle JD investigations in multiple counties or admin districts; (2) the basis for the appt of a spec pros and the scope of his authority to act in multiple counties or jud admin dist; (3) the scope of the secrecy orders, and (4) whether any of the petitioners subm to this crt should remain under seal. They should also provide this court with copies of any materials in their possession relevant to these issues. FRO that the chief judges of the four jud admin districts at issue may, but need not, respond to the writ pet. The chief judges shall be exempt from this courts order sealing the petitioners writ materials so that they may eval whether to participate. If the chief judges need access to any other materials that may be subject to a secrecy ord in ord to prepare any resp that any of them elects to submit, and they do not already have access to the JD invest, they should seek an exemp from the JD judge. FRO that resp shall confer with one another to determine whether they intend to file a joint resp or sep resps addressing the issues most relevant to each of them; and who will be representing them. The resps shall then, within 5 business days of this order, notify opposing counsel as to how they can each be served. The petitioners shall have an addl 3 business days to serve the writ pet and all accompanying materials upon the resp. Resp shall then have 20 days to file their resp. required by this crt. FRO that if any of the resp believe that some or all of their subm should remain confid, they should file subm under seal & present crt w/ arg as to why they should remain under seal and for how long. Fro that mtn to cert one or more issues to SC is held in abeyance until rec'd responses Comment: Motion to Unseal Supporting Memorandum and Motion for Stay

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 1-30-2014

ORD that the motion to certify this matter to the Wisconsin Supreme Court is denied.

FRO that the consolidated petitions for a supervisory writ are denied.

FRO that the special prosecutor shall file and serve a redacted copy of the affidavits and materials accompanying his response, consistent with this order.

FRO that the clerk of this court shall place the following documents under seal in a manila envelope: (1) the petition for a supervisory writ; (2) the affidavit supporting the writ petition; (3) Exhibit 1 to the writ petition; (4) the affidavits and exhibits accompanying the Special Prosecutors response; and (5) the petitioners supplemental filing and attachments related to an order issued by the John Doe judge while this matter has been pending. All other documents, including the redacted materials from the special prosecutor once they are filed, may be placed in a correspondence file open to public inspection.

Comment: Suggestion of Certification to SC -- held in abeyance until responses rec'd

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Motion for Stay

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 11-22-2013

ORD that the mtn to consolidate these matters into a single writ proceeding and to waive all but one of the filing fees is granted. FRO that the mtn to file the writ petn under seal is granted and the mtn to exempt the memo in supp of the pet from the seal is denied, for such time as the underlying JD investigations are still pending and any relevant secrecy orders issued by the JD judge(s) are still in eff, or until fro of this crt following an in camera insp of any docs any party asks this crt to order to remain under seal. FRO that the mtn to stay all further proceedings in the underlying JD invest is denied at this time. Proceedings may cont in any or all of these matters unless and until this crt ords otherwise. FRO that the reg in the writ pet for orders prohibiting any reserve judge to serve as the JD judge and prohibiting either a JD judge or a spec pros from using a p.o. box for the delivery of documents related to the investigations are denied, and no resp are req on those issues. FRO that the JD judge and spec pros must respond to the four remaining issues in the writ pet and the mtns to seal and unseal various docs. At a min, they should address: (1) both the factual basis and legal authority for the assignment of a single reserve judge to handle JD investigations in multiple counties or admin districts; (2) the basis for the appt of a spec pros and the scope of his authority to act in multiple counties or jud admin dist; (3) the scope of the secrecy orders, and (4) whether any of the petitioners subm to this crt should remain under seal. They should also provide this court with copies of any materials in their possession relevant to these issues. FRO that the chief judges of the four jud admin districts at issue may, but need not, respond to the writ pet. The chief judges shall be exempt from this courts order sealing the petitioners writ materials so that they may eval whether to participate. If the chief judges need access to any other materials that may be subject to a secrecy ord in ord to prepare any resp that any of them elects to submit, and they do not already have access to the JD invest, they should seek an exemp from the JD judge. FRO that resp shall confer with one another to determine whether they intend to file a joint resp or sep resps addressing the issues most relevant to each of them; and who will be representing them. The resps shall then, within 5 business days of this order, notify opposing counsel as to how they can each be served. The petitioners shall have an addl 3 business days to serve the writ pet and all accompanying materials upon the resp. Resp shall then have 20 days to file their resp. required by this crt. FRO that if any of the resp believe that some or all of their subm should remain confid, they should file subm under seal & present crt w/ arg as to why they should remain under seal and for how long. Fro that mtn to cert one or more issues to SC is held in abeyance until rec'd responses Comment: stay of investigation

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Motion for Miscellaneous Relief

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 11-22-2013

ORD that the mtn to consolidate these matters into a single writ proceeding and to waive all but one of the filing fees is granted. FRO that the mtn to file the writ petn under seal is granted and the mtn to exempt the memo in supp of the pet from the seal is denied, for such time as the underlying JD investigations are still pending and any relevant secrecy orders issued by the JD judge(s) are still in eff, or until fro of this crt following an in camera insp of any docs any party asks this crt to order to remain under seal. FRO that the mtn to stay all further proceedings in the underlying JD invest is denied at this time. Proceedings may cont in any or all of these matters unless and until this crt ords otherwise. FRO that the req in the writ pet for orders prohibiting any reserve judge to serve as the JD judge and prohibiting either a JD judge or a spec pros from using a p.o. box for the delivery of documents related to the investigations are denied, and no resp are req on those issues. FRO that the JD judge and spec pros must respond to the four remaining issues in the writ pet and the mtns to seal and unseal various docs. At a min, they should address: (1) both the factual basis and legal authority for the assignment of a single reserve judge to handle JD investigations in multiple counties or admin districts; (2) the basis for the appt of a spec pros and the scope of his authority to act in multiple counties or jud admin dist; (3)

the scope of the secrecy orders, and (4) whether any of the petitioners subm to this crt should remain under seal. They should also provide this court with copies of any materials in their possession relevant to these issues. FRO that the chief judges of the four jud admin districts at issue may, but need not, respond to the writ pet. The chief judges shall be exempt from this courts order sealing the petitioners writ materials so that they may eval whether to participate. If the chief judges need access to any other materials that may be subject to a secrecy ord in ord to prepare any resp that any of them elects to submit, and they do not already have access to the JD invest, they should seek an exemp from the JD judge. FRO that resp shall confer with one another to determine whether they intend to file a joint resp or sep resps addressing the issues most relevant to each of them; and who will be representing them. The resps shall then, within 5 business days of this order, notify opposing counsel as to how they can each be served. The petitioners shall have an addl 3 business days to serve the writ pet and all accompanying materials upon the resp. Resp shall then have 20 days to file their resp. required by this crt. FRO that if any of the resp believe that some or all of their subm should remain confid, they should file subm under seal & present crt w/ arg as to why they should remain under seal and for how long. Fro that mtn to cert one or more issues to SC is held in abeyance until rec'd responses Comment: Motion to Seal Petition, Affidavit and Exhibits

OCCD CA 11-14-2013 Certificate of Service

Comment: served Judge Kluka by mail

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Motion to Consolidate

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (G) Grant Decision Date: 11-22-2013

ORD that the mtn to consolidate these matters into a single writ proceeding and to waive all but one of the filing fees is granted. FRO that the mtn to file the writ petn under seal is granted and the mtn to exempt the memo in supp of the pet from the seal is denied, for such time as the underlying JD investigations are still pending and any relevant secrecy orders issued by the JD judge(s) are still in eff, or until fro of this crt following an in camera insp of any docs any party asks this crt to order to remain under seal. FRO that the mtn to stay all further proceedings in the underlying JD invest is denied at this time. Proceedings may cont in any or all of these matters unless and until this crt ords otherwise. FRO that the req in the writ pet for orders prohibiting any reserve judge to serve as the JD judge and prohibiting either a JD judge or a spec pros from using a p.o. box for the delivery of documents related to the investigations are denied, and no resp are reg on those issues. FRO that the JD judge and spec pros must respond to the four remaining issues in the writ pet and the mtns to seal and unseal various docs. At a min, they should address: (1) both the factual basis and legal authority for the assignment of a single reserve judge to handle JD investigations in multiple counties or admin districts; (2) the basis for the appt of a spec pros and the scope of his authority to act in multiple counties or jud admin dist; (3) the scope of the secrecy orders, and (4) whether any of the petitioners subm to this crt should remain under seal. They should also provide this court with copies of any materials in their possession relevant to these issues. FRO that the chief judges of the four jud admin districts at issue may, but need not, respond to the writ pet. The chief judges shall be exempt from this courts order sealing the petitioners writ materials so that they may eval whether to participate. If the chief judges need access to any other materials that may be subject to a secrecy ord in ord to prepare any resp that any of them elects to submit, and they do not already have access to the JD invest, they should seek an exemp from the JD judge. FRO that resp shall confer with one another to determine whether they intend to file a joint resp or sep resps addressing the issues most relevant to each of them; and who will be representing them. The resps shall then, within 5 business days of this order, notify opposing counsel as to how they can each be served. The petitioners shall have an addl 3 business days to serve the writ pet and all accompanying materials upon the resp. Resp shall then have 20 days to file their resp. required by this crt. FRO that if any of the resp believe that some or all of their subm should remain confid, they should file subm under seal & present crt w/ arg as to why they should remain under seal and for how long. Fro

that mtn to cert one or more issues to SC is held in abeyance until rec'd responses

Comment: [2013AP002504, 2013AP002505, 2013AP002506, 2013AP002507, 2013AP002508]

OCCD CA 11-14-2013

Filed By: David Rice Submit Date: 12-23-2013

Comment: w/ Memo in Support of Petition

Petition for Supervisory Writ

Filed By: Dean Strang Submit Date: 11-14-2013 Decision: (D) Deny Decision Date: 1-30-2014 ORD that the motion to certify this matter to the Wisconsin Supreme Court is denied. FRO that the consolidated petitions for a supervisory writ are denied. FRO that the special prosecutor shall file and serve a redacted copy of the affidavits and materials accompanying his response, consistent with this order. FRO that the clerk of this court shall place the following documents under seal in a manila envelope: (1) the petition for a supervisory writ; (2) the affidavit supporting the writ petition; (3) Exhibit 1 to the writ petition; (4) the affidavits and exhibits accompanying the Special Prosecutors response; and (5) the petitioners supplemental filing and attachments related to an order issued by the John Doe judge while this matter has been pending. All other documents, including the redacted materials from the special prosecutor once they are filed, may be placed in a correspondence file open to public inspection. Motion Response Filed By: Francis Schmitz Submit Date: 12-20-2013 Motion Response