

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

RONALD MCCRAY

*Petitioner,*

v.

The CITY OF BELOIT, CHIEF OF POLICE DAVID B. ZIBOLSKI in his individual and official capacities, CAPTAIN DAN RISSE in his individual and official capacities, SERGEANT EDMUND GATES in his individual and official capacities, and OFFICER KERRY DAUGHERTY in his individual and official capacities,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
Wisconsin Court of Appeals; District IV**

---

**PETITIONER'S APPENDIX: VOLUME-1  
PAGES 1-81**

---

*Amended:* January, 8, 2024  
Filed: November 14, 2023

RONALD MCCRAY  
2405 Sunshine Lane  
Beloit, WI 53511  
(608) 365-4347  
rmccray@ticon.net

*Petitioner Proceeding Pro-Se*

---

**APPENDIX**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS: VOLUME-1**

<b>Pages 1 – 81</b>	<b>Page</b>
Order, Denying Petition for Review, Wisconsin Supreme Court, McCray v. City of Beloit, No. 2021AP693 L.C. # 2018CV421 (Aug. 17, 2023).....	APP-1
Opinion and Order (Unpublished), Summarily Affirmed Circuit Court Order in Part and Reversed in Part, Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District IV, Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit, No. 2021AP693 (L.C. #2018CV421) (Mar. 2, 2023).....	APP-2
Ronald McCray's Motion for Reconsideration of Court of Appeals Opinion and Order 2021AP693, Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit, Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District IV, Appeal No. 2021AP000693, Circuit Court Case No. 2018CV000421, Filed, (Mar. 21, 2023).....	APP-17
Order, Denying Motion for Reconsideration, Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District IV, Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit, No. 2021AP693 (L.C. #2018CV421) (Mar. 22, 2023).....	APP-26
Transcript Excerpts: Motion Hearing, Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit, Rock County Circuit Court Case No. 2017CV0689, Hon. Daniel T. Dillon, Judge, (October 24, 2017).....	APP-28
Order of Dismissal, Without Prejudice,	

Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit,  
Circuit Court Case No. 17-CV-689: Signed by  
Circuit Court Judge, Daniel T. Dillon,  
(Nov. 1, 2017).....APP-38

Transcript Excerpts: Motion Hearing,  
Ronald McCray v. City of Beloit, et. al.,  
Rock County Circuit Court Case No.  
18-CV-421, Hon. Jeffery S. Kuglitsch, Judge,  
(August 3, 2018).....APP-40

**Proposed:** Stipulation and Order of Dismissal  
of all Claims, With Prejudice, Ronald McCray v.  
The City of Beloit, et. al., Circuit Court Case  
No.18-CV-421: Court Order Written by Defendants  
and their Attorneys (Aug. 6, 2018).....APP-72

**Proposed:** Order of Dismissal, With Prejudice,  
Ronald McCray v. City of Beloit, et. al., Circuit  
Court Case No.18-CV-421: Court Order  
Written by Defendants and their Attorneys  
(Aug. 22, 2018).....APP-76

Order of Dismissal, With Prejudice,  
Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit, et. al.,  
Circuit Court Case No.18-CV-421: Signed by  
Judge, Jeffrey S. Kuglitsch, (Aug. 23, 2018)....APP-79

Office of the Clerk  
**Supreme Court of Wisconsin**  
110 East Main Street, Suite 215, P.O. Box 1688,  
Madison, WI 53701-1688  
Telephone: (608)266-1880  
Facsimile (608)267-0640  
Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

[Stamped]: Received  
AUG 19, 2023  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

August 17, 2023

*To:*

Hon. Jeffrey Kuglitsch Circuit Court Judge Electronic Notice	Kyle W. Engelke Electronic Notice
Jacki Gackstatter Clerk of Circuit Court Rock County Courthouse Electronic Notice	Ronald McCray 2405 Sunshine Ln. Beloit, WI 53511

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered  
the following order

---

No. 2021AP693      McCray v. City of Beloit  
L.C.# 2018CV421

A petition for review pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 808.10  
having been filed on behalf of plaintiff-appellant-  
petitioner, Ronald McCray, pro se, and considered by  
this court;

**IT IS ORDERED** that the petition for review is  
denied, without costs.

---

Samuel A. Christensen / Clerk of Supreme Court

Office of the Clerk  
**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS**  
110 East Main Street, Suite 215, P.O. Box 1688  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1688  
Telephone (608) 266-1880  
TTY: (800) 947-3529  
Facsimile (608) 267-0640  
Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

## **DISTRICT IV**

[Stamped]: Received  
Mar 03, 2023  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

March 2, 2023

To:

Hon. Jeffrey Kuglitsch  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Jacki Gackstatter  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Rock County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Ronald McCray  
2405 Sunshine Ln.  
Beloit, WI 53511

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

2021AP693      Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit  
(L.C. # 2018CV421)

Before Fitzpatrick, Graham, and Nashold, JJ.

**Summary disposition orders may not be cited in any court of this state as precedent or**

**authority, except for the limited purposes  
specified in WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(3).**

Ronald McCray, pro se, appeals an order of the circuit court that denied his motion for rehearing of an action that was previously dismissed by the circuit court and subject to appellate review. After reviewing the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2021-22).<sup>1</sup> We affirm the portion of the circuit court's order that denied McCray's motion for rehearing, and we reverse the portion of the order that sanctioned McCray pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 802.05.

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2021-22 version.

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 2 of 11**

### **Background**

This is McCray's second appeal in the second of three actions that he filed in the circuit court, all of which stem from a Beloit Police Department investigation that occurred on February 23, 2017. Much of the following factual background is taken from our prior order, which summarily affirmed the circuit court's dismissal of McCray's second action. *See McCray v. City of Beloit*, No. 2018AP1648, unpublished op. and order (Ct. App. July 26, 2019; as amended Aug. 30, 2019), *review denied* (WI Dec. 13, 2019). For ease of reference, we refer to that order as our "July 26, 2019 order."

On February 23, 2017, the Beloit Police Department received a call from an employee of a

Beloit dental office, who reported that McCray “got hold of some paper work” and was calling the office’s patients. A police officer made contact with McCray, who stated that he had found a patient list in his front yard and had called patients on the list to alert them that their personal information should be handled with more care. The officer determined that no crime had been committed and no ordinance violated, and he closed the investigation that day. McCray took issue with how the incident and investigation were described in a police incident report.

In August 2017, McCray commenced his first action, docketed as Rock County Case No. 2017CV689, by filing a complaint against the City of Beloit. In his complaint, McCray alleged that the police investigation was false and misdirected. The City moved to dismiss the complaint based on McCray’s failure to comply with WIS. STAT. § 893.80, which sets forth notice requirements for certain claims against governmental bodies.<sup>2</sup> Then, on September 28,

---

<sup>2</sup> WISCONSIN STAT. § 893.80(1d) and (1d)(a) provide, in relevant part:

(continued)

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 3 of 11**

2017, after receiving the City’s motion to dismiss, McCray served the City with a document entitled “Notice of Circumstances Giving Rise to Claim and Claim.”

The circuit court held a hearing on the City's motion to dismiss McCray's first action. Following the hearing, the court issued a final order which dismissed the complaint without prejudice. The court determined that any claim arising more than 120 days before McCray served his notice of claim on the City (that is, any claim arising before May 31, 2017) was "untimely pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 893.80." The court further determined that the claims in McCray's complaint were untimely because they arose before that date. McCray did not appeal the order dismissing his first action.

In April 2018, McCray commenced his second action, docketed as Rock County Case No. 2018CV421, by filing a complaint against the City and several of its police officers (collectively, the City). McCray's complaint alleged defamation and other claims, all related to the City's actions with respect to the February 23, 2017 phone call from the dental office. The City moved to dismiss the complaint. After a hearing, the circuit court found that all of McCray's claims related back to the February 23, 2017 phone call, and the court granted the motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice. The court also determined that the defamation

---

[N]o action may be brought or maintained against any ... political corporation, governmental subdivision or agency thereof nor against any officer, official, agent or employee of the corporation, subdivision or agency for acts done in their official capacity or in the course of their agency or employment upon a claim or cause of action unless:

(a) Within 120 days after the happening of the event giving rise to the claim, written notice of the circumstances of the claim signed by the party, agent or attorney is served on the ... political corporation, governmental subdivision or

agency and on the officer, official, agent or employee under s. 801.11.

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 4 of 11**

claim did not state a claim for relief because none of the statements in the incident report were capable of a defamatory meaning. McCray appealed the order dismissing his second action.

On July 26, 2019, we summarily affirmed the circuit court's order dismissing McCray's second action. *McCray*, No. 2018AP1648. In our July 26, 2019 order, we concluded that "the latest any of McCray's claims arose was March 3, 2017," meaning that "McCray was required to file a notice of claim on or before July 2, 2017." *Id.* at 4. We further concluded that, because "McCray did not serve any notice of claim ... until September 28, 2017, which was well after the 120-day deadline ... had passed," McCray's second action was untimely and the circuit court properly dismissed his complaint for failure to comply with WIS. STAT. § 893.80(1d)(a). *Id.* McCray petitioned our supreme court for review of the July 26, 2019 order, and our supreme court denied his petition.

Meanwhile, when McCray's appeal of the dismissal of his second action was still pending, he filed a third action, docketed as Rock County Case No. 2019CV386, against various officials and employees of the City. This third action again related to the February 23, 2017 phone call. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss based on the doctrine of issue preclusion, and they also sought sanctions under WIS. STAT. § 802.05(3) for a frivolous filing.<sup>3</sup> The circuit

---

<sup>3</sup> WISCONSIN STAT. § 802.05(2) provides that, by signing, filing, or submitting a motion to a court, the signer is certifying that, “to the best of the person’s knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances”:

- (a) The paper is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.
- (b) The claims, defenses, and other legal contentions stated in the paper are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument

(continued)

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 5 of 11**

court entered an order dismissing McCray’s third action and awarding sanctions,<sup>4</sup> and we ultimately affirmed the circuit court’s order and granted the defendants’ motion for sanctions for a frivolous appeal. *See McCray v. Luther*, No. 2019AP1993, unpublished op. and order (Ct. App. Apr. 15, 2021).

With this background in mind, we turn to the motion that is the subject of McCray’s current appeal. On December 11, 2020, McCray filed a “Motion for the Rehearing” of his second action, Case No. 2018CV421, “for Reasons of Fraud, Misrepresentation, and a Miscarriage of Justice.” On December 18, 2020, the City filed a letter with the circuit court, which it characterized as a safe harbor notice. In this letter, the City represented that it was sending a copy to McCray, and it notified McCray that, under WIS. STAT. § 802.05, “he ha[d] 21 days to

withdraw his motion [for rehearing].” The City’s letter to the court stated that the motion for rehearing was “fatally flawed,” and that McCray could not collaterally attack this court’s July 26, 2019 order by refiling a challenge in the circuit court. Then, on January 21, 2021, the City filed a second letter, which renewed the City’s warning “that [McCray] ha[d] 21 days to

---

for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law.

WISCONSIN STAT. § 802.05(3) provides that a court “may impose an appropriate sanction upon the ... parties that have violated sub. (2) or are responsible for the violation” by granting a motion filed under paragraph (3)(a)1. Section 802.05(3)(a)1. provides that “[a] motion for sanctions under this rule ... shall not be filed with ... the court unless, within 21 days after service of the motion ... the challenged paper ... is not withdrawn.”

<sup>4</sup> Specifically, the circuit court ordered McCray to pay attorney fees incurred by the City after a specified date, and the court’s order also provided that, “unless [McCray] is granted appellate relief in this action and/or the pending appeal in [Case No. 2018CV421], Plaintiff Ronald McCray is permanently enjoined from filing any further complaint or pleading against anyone that is in any way arising out of and/or related to the events of February 2017 and/or the allegations made in this action and/or [Case No.2018CV421].”

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 6 of 11**

withdraw his recently filed motion.” To this letter, the City attached the sanctions motion that it had previously filed in response to McCray’s third action,

Case No. 2019CV386, which had been granted by the circuit court in that case.

McCray did not withdraw his motion for rehearing.

On February 22, 2021, the City filed a third letter, which asked the circuit court to deny McCray's motion for rehearing and to award the City sanctions based on McCray's failure to withdraw his motion. The City submitted a proposed order along with its letter. McCray objected. He argued, among other things, that his motion for rehearing was not frivolous, that it was meritorious, and that the City's letters to the court seeking sanctions were not properly served and did not follow the procedure set forth in WIS. STAT. § 802.05(3).

On March 4, 2021, the circuit court issued the order that is the subject of this current appeal. In its order, the court denied McCray's motions for rehearing and awarded fees and costs, including reasonable attorney fees, to the City pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 802.05. The court further enjoined McCray "from filing any further complaint, pleading or motion against anyone that is in any way arising out of and/or related to the events of February 2017 and/or the allegations made in this action."

McCray appeals. The City filed a brief in opposition to McCray's appeal, and has also moved for sanctions for a frivolous appeal pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.25(3). McCray opposes the City's motion for sanctions.

**Discussion**

McCray contends that the circuit court erroneously denied his motion for rehearing. In that motion and on appeal, he argues that the circuit court orders dismissing his first and second actions (2017CV689 and 2018CV421) misrepresented the facts and law and are void on that basis, and that our July 26, 2019 order is likewise void because it misrepresents the facts and law. The arguments McCray makes in his motion for rehearing and on appeal are arguments that he previously raised—or could have raised—in his first, second, and third circuit court actions and in his prior appeals.

We need not and do not decide the merits of McCray's legal and factual arguments because they are procedurally barred. To the extent that the earlier circuit courts made legal or factual errors when they dismissed McCray's first and second actions, McCray's remedy was to appeal those orders. McCray did not appeal the dismissal of his first action, and we affirmed the dismissal of his second action on appeal. Thus, the issues that were raised—or that could have been raised—in those proceedings have already been decided, and our July 26, 2019 order represents the law of the case. *Univest Corp. v. General Split Corp.*, 148 Wis. 2d 29, 38, 435 N.W.2d 234 (1989) (stating that the law of the case doctrine is a “longstanding rule that a decision on a legal issue by an appellate court establishes the law of the case, which must be followed in all subsequent proceedings in the [circuit] court or on later appeal”). As the City cautioned in its letter to the court regarding McCray's

motion for rehearing, McCray cannot relitigate the conclusions in our July 26, 2019 order by filing a motion for rehearing in the circuit court. *See generally Univest Corp.*, 148 Wis. 2d at 38; *see also Northern States Power Co. v.*

**Bugher**, 189 Wis. 2d 541, 549-51, 525 N.W.2d 723 (1995) (discussing the doctrines of claim

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 8 of 11**

preclusion and issue preclusion, which relate to the common law doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel).

McCray also argues that the circuit court erroneously ordered him to pay the City's attorney fees pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 802.05. He asserts that his motion for rehearing was not frivolous, and that, in seeking sanctions, the City failed to follow the procedure set forth in § 802.05(3).

We conclude the circuit court had an ample factual and legal basis for determining that McCray's motion for rehearing was frivolous based on the standard set forth in WIS. STAT. § 802.05(1). As we have explained, McCray's motion is an impermissible attempt to relitigate issues that have already been litigated in a final judgment that has been affirmed by this court.

Even so, we nonetheless conclude that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion when it sanctioned McCray under WIS. STAT. § 802.05(3) because the City did not follow the process set forth under that statute for seeking sanctions for a

frivolous filing. Under the process set forth in § 802.05(3), the City was required to serve a safe harbor letter on McCray at least 21 days before filing a motion for sanctions with the court. The City did not follow this process—it instead filed letters with the court, which asserted that McCray's motion was frivolous and made reference to a prior safe harbor letter that the City had served on McCray in another case, and it then filed a letter and proposed order rather than a motion asking the court to impose sanctions. The City does not provide any legal authority for the alternative process it fashioned, nor does the City argue that any procedural error was harmless.

We therefore affirm the portion of the circuit court's order that denied McCray's motion, and we reverse the portion of the order that awarded sanctions to the City under WIS. STAT.

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 9 of 11**

§ 802.05(3). As a result of our order in this appeal, McCray will not be required to pay the fees and costs that the City incurred in responding to his motion for rehearing in this action, Case No. 2018CV421. We emphasize that our order today in no way affects the sanctions that the circuit court ordered in McCray's third action, Case No. 2019CV386, or the sanctions that we ordered in our appeal of that action, Appeal No. 2019AP1993.

This matter does not end here, however, because the City has moved for sanctions for this appeal pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.25(3). The

City argues that the appeal is frivolous, and that some type of sanction is necessary to protect the court system from the continued waste of time and resources caused by the frivolous circuit court proceedings and appeals McCray initiates.

We conclude that the City is not entitled to an award of attorney fees under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.25(3). We agree with the City that the arguments McCray advances about the circuit court's denial of his motion for rehearing are frivolous under the standards set forth in RULE 809.25(3)(c) (allowing an award of costs and fees, including reasonable attorney fees, if we find an appeal to be without any reasonable basis in law or equity and not supported by a good faith argument for an extension, modification, or reversal of existing law). However, as we have explained, McCray's appeal of the circuit court's sanctions award is not frivolous and, therefore, his entire appeal is not frivolous. *See Howell v. Denomie*, 2005 WI 85, ¶9, 282 Wis. 2d 130, 698 N.W.2d 621 (providing that an appeal is not frivolous under RULE 809.25(3)(a) if the entire appeal is not frivolous); *see also Thompson v. Ouellette*, 2023 WI App 7, ¶¶26-45, \_\_\_ Wis. 2d \_\_, \_\_\_ N.W.2d \_\_\_ (discussing a similar standard under WIS. STAT. § 895.044(5)).

No. 2021AP693

**Page: 10 of 11**

However, we agree with the City that McCray has engaged in a pattern of frivolous and vexatious litigation at significant cost to the court system and, ultimately, to taxpayers. McCray's appeal of the

portion of the circuit court order that denied his motion for rehearing is not only frivolous, but it is also abusive in terms of the language and accusations directed at the court system, attorneys, and parties.

One method of limiting an abusive litigant's access to the courts is to require the litigant to obtain prior approval for any future filings, on a case-by-case basis, so as to prevent additional frivolous filings. *See State v. Casteel*, 2001 WI App 188, ¶¶23-25, 247 Wis. 2d 451, 634 N.W.2d 338, *review denied* (WI Oct. 23, 2001). This method has the virtue of allowing a litigant access to the courts for any meritorious claims that may arise, while still comporting with the general disapproval of blanket orders. *Id.*, ¶¶26-27. We conclude on our own motion that a *Casteel*-type order is warranted here.

Accordingly, because McCray is abusing the appellate process, no further filings will be accepted from him unless he submits by affidavit all of the following: (1) a copy of the circuit court's written decision and order he seeks to appeal; (2) a statement setting forth the specific grounds upon which this court can grant relief; and (3) a statement showing how the issues sought to be raised differ from issues raised and previously adjudicated. Upon review of these documents, we will not accept the filing if we determine that McCray states no claim, defense, or appeal upon which we may grant relief. If we cannot determine from the submitted documents whether the appeal has merit, we may require additional documents or submissions from the parties.

**Page: 11 of 11**

This order is drafted narrowly to strike a balance between McCray's access to the courts, the taxpayers' right not to have frivolous litigation become an unwarranted drain on their resources, and the public interest in maintaining the integrity of the judicial system. *See Minniecheske v. Griesbach*, 161 Wis. 2d 743, 749, 468 N.W.2d 760 (Ct. App. 1991) (orders limiting access to courts "should be narrowly tailored and rarely issued"). The prefilming review we require is consistent with limits on court access under both Wisconsin law and federal law. *See* WIS. STAT. § 814.29(1)(c) (indigent parties may be denied a waiver of costs "if the court finds that the affidavit states no claim, defense or appeal upon which the court may grant relief"); *In re Davis*, 878 F.2d 211, 212-13 (7th Cir. 1989) (threshold review of the merits is "a sensible and constitutional means of dealing with a litigant intent on pressing frivolous litigation").

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the circuit court order is summarily affirmed in part and reversed in part under WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the City's motion for sanctions in the form of costs, fees, and reasonable attorney fees is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, going forward, if the clerk's office receives appellate filings from McCray, the clerk shall not immediately docket the filings and shall instead send the filing to this court for review under *Casteel*, 247 Wis. 2d 451, ¶¶23-25.

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Appeal No. 2021AP000693

**Caption / Cover Page**

STATE OF WISCONSIN - COURT OF  
APPEALS - DISTRICT IV

---

**Date:** March 21, 2023

**Appeal No.** 2021AP000693

**Circuit Court Case No.**  
2018CV000421

[Court Stamp]: RECEIVED  
MAR 21 2023  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
OF WISCONSIN

RONALD MCCRAY,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

The City of Beloit,  
David B. Zibolski, Chief of Police,  
Captain Dan Risse, Sergeant Edmund Gates  
and Officer Kerry Daugherty,

Defendants-Respondents.

---

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
COURT OF APPEALS OPINION AND ORDER  
2021AP693 RONALD MCCRAY V. THE CITY OF  
BELOIT (L.C. # 2018CV421)**

---

[Court Stamp]: JACKI GACKSTATTER  
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT

2023 MAR 21 PM 12: 14  
ROCK COUNTY WI  
FILED

Respectfully Submitted,  
Ronald McCray  
Plaintiff-Appellant Acting pro-se  
2405 Sunshine Lane  
Beloit, WI 53511  
608-365-4347 (corrected 12/19/2023: s/Initialed: Pet.  
RM)

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Appeal No. 2021AP000693

**Page 1 of 5**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Plaintiff-Appellant, Ronald McCray, acting pro se, do hereby move this Court pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 809.24 (1) Rule (Reconsideration), to amend and reverse the Wisconsin Court of Appeals Opinion & Order, entered on March 2, 2023, that the circuit court order is summarily affirmed under Wis. Stat. Rule 809.21 for Rock County Circuit Court (RCCC) Case No. 2018CV000421, Appeal No. 2021AP000693.

The grounds for this motion is that Plaintiff-Appellant Ronald McCray asserts herein that the Wis. Court of Appeals District IV Order 2021AP693 is erroneous by not holding the Defendants-Respondents to comply with the same legal standards of Wis. Stat. § 893.80 as required by law, as it held McCray to and therefore discriminates against McCray; rendering this Court Order facially unconstitutional because it denies McCray of his “Guaranteed” 14th Amendment Civil Right to Equal

Protection of the Laws, and it is in direct conflict with Federal Law, and in direct conflict with Wis. State Law pursuant to the United States Constitution Amendment 14, Section 1, and Article VI, Section 2, the United States Supreme Court Precedent Ruling of Felder V. Casey 487 U.S. 131 (1988), 42 USC § 1983, Wis. Stat. § 893.80(1g) and (5), and all rules of law as so stated herein.

## **ARGUMENT**

**1.** Plaintiff-Appellant Ronald McCray is a 66 years and 9.5 months old African American Male natural born citizen of the United States of America, who is early retired and owner of <http://ismsronmccrayfineart.com/> and <http://ismsfineart.com/> at all times relevant hereto.

## **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Appeal No. 2021AP000693

### **Page 2 of 5**

**2.** The Defendants-Respondents: (1) The City of Beloit is a Wisconsin municipality located at 100 State Street, Beloit WI, and was the employer of; (2) Beloit Police Chief David B. Zibolski, who is being sued in his individual capacity; (3) Captain Dan Risse, who is being sued in his individual capacity; (4) Sergeant Edmund Gates, who is being sued in his individual capacity; and (5) Officer Kerry Daugherty, who is being sued in his individual capacity; at all times relevant hereto.

**3.** McCray has a right to request a rehearing within one year for reasons of fraud,

misrepresentation, a miscarriage of justice, and when the judgement is void, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 806.07(1)(b)(c)(d) and (2), and § 808(3), which he timely filed on December 10 2020.

**4. THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT IV, MADE AN ERROR IN ITS ORDER OF 2021AP693 WHEN IT DID NOT ENFORCE THE RULE OF LAW EQUALLY TO ALL PERSONS INVOLVED:**

Wis. Stat. § 893.80(1g) requires each Defendant-Respondent named in ¶2, without exception, to perform a known mandatory, nondiscretionary, ministerial duty of their office to serve McCray with a notice of disallowance of McCray's claim submitted under sub. (1d) which states:

(1g) Notice of disallowance of the claim submitted under sub. (1d) shall be served on the claimant by registered or certified mail and the receipt therefor, signed by the claimant, or the returned registered letter, shall be proof of service. Failure of the appropriate body to disallow a claim within 120 days after presentation of the written notice of the claim is a disallowance. No action on a claim under this section against any defendant fire company, corporation, subdivision or agency nor against any defendant officer, official, agent or employee, may be brought after 6 months from the date of service of the notice of disallowance, and the notice of disallowance shall contain a statement to that effect.

The Defendants-Respondents named in ¶2 failed to comply with Wis. Stat. 893.80(1g) by refusing to serve McCray with the aforesaid disallowance as

required by law depriving McCray of his 14th Amendment Civil Right to his Liberty Interest of fair and just treatment under the law without due process of law. The Wisconsin Court of Appeals District IV erroneously did not enforce this required “Rule of Law and Law of

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Appeal No. 2021AP000693

**Page 3 of 5**

**this Case**”, § 893.80(1g) on the Defendants-Respondents as it did § 893.80(1d)(a) on McCray. This constitutes fraud, misrepresentation, and a miscarriage of justice and establishes grounds for a rehearing.

**5. Wis. Stat. § 893.80 has 2 Statute of Limitations:** Wis. § 893.80 has two statute of limitations periods, one for those who are served with a notice of disallowance, and one for those who are not, pursuant to the Court of Appeals of Wisconsin ruling of Griffin v. Milwaukee Transport Services, Inc., 246 Wis. 2d 433 (2001), 2001 WI App 125, 630 N.W. 2d 536 (¶ 10). Therefore, the Rule of Law for this case goes to Wis. Stats. § 893.53 and § 893.57, which have 6 year and 3 year statute of limitations.

**6. THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS BASED AND ENFORCED ITS OPINION AND ORDER 2021AP693 ON A FALSE STATEMENT:**

The Court of Appeals Order 2021AP693, is based on McCray’s failure to timely comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80 (1d)(a). This is categorically false. McCray is being called a liar in all matters pertaining hereto. McCray takes exceptional issue with anyone calling

him a liar, when he, as a matter of fact, is the only person telling the truth. McCray timely complied with Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and served each of the Defendants-Respondents named in ¶2 with a Notice and Claim pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 893.80. It is not difficult to show irrefutable proof of who is lying and who is telling the truth in these matters. Therefore, McCray is requesting the Court of Appeals Dist. IV to “Order” McCray to file a motion in the Court of Appeals for this case and in the RCCC Case No. 18CV421 and attach his Affidavit/ Certificate of Service for each Defendant-Respondent, and “Order” the Defendants-Respondents named in ¶2 to file the same aforesaid motion and attach each registered or certified mail receipt or returned registered letter, Notice of Disallowance served on McCray as required by the law of this case, prior to the Court of Appeals disposing of this Motion for Reconsideration.

**7. THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT IV, MADE AN ERROR IN ITS ORDER OF 2021AP693 WHEN IT DID NOT ENFORCED NO RELITIGATING MATTERS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN ADJUDICATED ON THE DEFENDANTS-RESPONDENTS:** If RCCC Case No. 17CV689 is the law of this case, then what Judge Dillon

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
Appeal No. 2021AP000693

**Page 4 of 5**

ruled at the Motion Hearing of October 24, 2017, cannot be relitigated. The Defendants-Respondents did not file an appeal of this ruling. The Wisconsin Court of Appeals District IV, unfairly allowed the

Defendants-Respondents named in ¶2, and their attorneys, Kyle Engelke and other attorneys who are not identified in court record, to relitigate Judge Dillon's ruling stating everything relates back to the February 23, 2017 incident and therefore barred by Wis. Stat. § 893.80. **THERE IS NO SUCH RULE OF LAW.** Each unlawful act or inaction that is a cause of action has its own 120 day statute of limitations. There were multiple acts and inactions occurring throughout June of 2017 that were unlawfully barred and ignored. Judge Dillon ruled they were actionable. The Court of Appeals incorrectly states in its opinion on pg. 3, ¶2:

“The court determined that any claim arising more than 120 days before McCray served his notice of claim on the City (that is, any claim arising before May 31, 2017) was “untimely pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 893.80.” The court further determined that the claims in McCray’s complaint were untimely because they arose before that date.”

That is incorrect. The court determined that there were claims after May 31, 2017, and the City of Beloit had to consider McCray’s Notice and Claim pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 893.80, and that the Doctrine of Continuing Violations applied if there were (See: the Exhibit list of RCCCC No. 18CV421 for some of the unlawful acts; and Civil Complaint No. 18CV421; Pgs. 7-10, ¶27-¶36 for other causes of action).

**8. THE COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT IV, IS IN ERROR IN ITS ORDER OF 2021AP693 WHEN IT ENFORCED CLAIM PRECLUSION AND ISSUE PRECLUSION BY ENFORCING AN UNPUBLISHED OPINION AND ORDER THAT**

**IS IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE UNITED**

**STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE**

**WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT:** Summary

disposition orders and unpublished opinions and orders cannot be cited as precedent or authority for any purpose in the state of Wisconsin unless they are **“OFFICIALLY PUBLISHED”**, repeat precedent rules of law and repeat established rules of law, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 752.41(2). This Opinion and Order is not, and does not. Unpublished opinions can only be cited to **“SUPPORT”** a claim of claim preclusion, issue preclusion, or the law of the case pursuant to Rule: Wis. Stat. § 809(3)(a) 809.23(3)(a) (corrected 12/19/2023 s/Initialed: Pet.RM).

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Appeal No. 2021AP000693

**Page 5 of 5**

**9. THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT RULE IS CITING UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS IN APPELLATE PROCEDURE IS NOT TOLERATED;** (See: **Tamminen v Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.** 109 Wis.2d 536, 327 N.W.2d 55 (1982); 563-564, ¶3 [7] and [8]). The Court of Appeals of Wisconsin does not tolerate the citing of its own unpublished opinion or even the naked citation to it; (See: **Kuhn v. Allstate Insurance Co.** 181 Wis.2d 453, 510 N.W.2d 826 (1993); 467 ¶3-468).

**10. THE WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT IV, IGNORGED THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT RULING OF FELDER V. CASEY 487 U.S. 131 (1988) WHEN CITING CASES IN ITS OPINION AND ORDER**

**2021AP693:** Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District 4

Opinion and Order 2018AP1648 is in direct conflict with Federal Law, the United States Supreme Court Precedent Ruling of *Felder v. Casey* 487 U.S. 131 (1988). Federal Actions cannot be defeated by a state statute of limitations (See *Felder v. Casey*, 487 U.S. 131 (1988); at Pg. 487 U.S. 138, ¶2; pg. 487 U.S. 139, ¶4; and pg. 487 U.S. 140, ¶1-¶2.)

**11. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – “Elder Abuse” Violation of Wis. Stat. § 46.90 (1)(a)(br) (cm)(ed)(1) and (2); and**

**§ 943.20(1)(a)(2)(ad)(ag)(b)(d) and (3) (a):** The Defendants-Respondents named in ¶2 are engaged in Elder Abuse by forcing McCray, an Elder, to act against his will and unlawfully taking money from McCray on or about November 11, 2021, under fraudulent pretenses via the Rock County Circuit Court, depriving McCray of his 14th Amendment property interest Civil Right of \$778.50, without due process of law.

**Conclusion**

Wherefore, McCray respectfully request the Court of Appeals to reconsider, amend and reverse its Order affirming the Circuit Court’s Order and enter the correct judgement for this case, according to McCray’s Reply Brief page 13. ¶18, and issue orders as requested in ¶6 herein. There has been a miscarriage of justice.

Respectfully Submitted:

Dated: March 21, 2023

s/Ronald McCray  
Ronald McCray,  
acting pro se

Office of the Clerk  
**WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS**  
110 East Main Street, Suite 215, P.O. Box 1688  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1688  
Telephone (608) 266-1880  
TTY: (800) 947-3529  
Facsimile (608) 267-0640  
Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

## **DISTRICT IV**

[Stamped]: Received  
Mar 22, 2023  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

March 22, 2023

To:

Hon. Jeffrey Kuglitsch  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

**Jacki Gackstatter**  
**Clerk of Circuit Court**  
**Rock County Courthouse**  
**Electronic Notice**

**Ronald McCray**  
**2405 Sunshine Ln.**  
**Beloit, WI 53511**

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

**2021AP693 Ronald McCray v. The City of Beloit  
(L.C.# 2018CV421)**

Before Fitzpatrick, Graham, and Nashold, JJ.

The appellant moves for reconsideration of this court's summary disposition entered March, 2, 2023. The motion does not cause us to amend the order.

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is denied.

---

*Sheila T. Reiff  
Clerk of Court of Appeals*

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 1**

2 STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT  
ROCK COUNTY

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4 RONALD MCCRAY,

5 Plaintiff,

6 vs. Case No. 2017CV689

7 THE CITY OF BELOIT,

8 Defendant.

9 \* \* \* \* \*

13 PROCEEDINGS: Motion Hearing

14 DATE: October 24, 2017

15

16 COURT: The Honorable Daniel T.  
Dillon

17 Circuit Court Judge,  
Presiding

18

19 APPEARANCES: Ronald McCray, appearing  
pro se;

20 Kyle Engelke, Attorney at  
Law,

21 Appearng on behalf of the  
defendant.

22

23

24

25

REPORTER: Linda M. Blum

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 16**

1           THE COURT: And what you have  
to complain about

2    has to have occurred no more than 120 days  
sooner than

3   September 28th?

4           MR. McCRAY: That's correct.

5           THE COURT: Or earlier rather  
than sooner. So

6   if we to 120 days back from September 28th,  
where do you

7   get to? Well, we know we have 31 days in  
August. We

8   know we have 28 days in September, we know  
we have

9   31 days in July, and we know we have 30 days  
in June.

10   That gets you to 120 days. You don't count the  
first day

11   but you count the last day.

12   So it looks like, based on the notice you  
tell

13   me you gave, and using your facts on giving the  
notice,

14 your cause of action has to have accrued  
sometime --

15 MR. ENGELKE: I have May 31st,

16 THE COURT: On May 31st, or later  
than

17 May 31st.

18 MR. McCRAY: Also, your Honor,  
can I add--

19 THE COURT: No. You may not.  
I'm trying to

20 focus on these dates. I'm not making a  
determination if

21 your claim is valid or invalid, I'm making a  
22 determination today of whether you're out of  
court

23 because the deadline expired. No matter how  
good your

24 case is, if you miss the deadline, you don't have  
a right

25 to bring the claim. That's a statutory  
prohibition,

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 17**

1 statutory creation that the legislature has  
designed

2 specifically to put municipalities on an  
accelerated

3 path.

4 It's a greater protection for  
municipalities

5 than an individual would have by design. So  
any claim

6 that you have that you have included in your  
notice that

7 arose that looks like you agree that the date is  
the 31<sup>st</sup>

8 of May for you 120 days.

9 Mr. McCRAY: And I did not receive  
the  
10 procedural -

11 THE COURT: No, no. Answer my  
question.

12 You're relying on a very strict 120-day period.  
You know

13 that's what we're all talking about. Based on  
what

14 you've told me, the date your notice was served,  
wouldn't

15 120 days go back to the 31st of May?

16 MR. McCRAY: Yes.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So now I  
assume that fact

18 is proven and true. Are you in a position to  
respond to

19 this, counsel?

20           MR. ENGELKE: In the sense of – I  
don't  
21 contend that he did serve the notice of –  
22           THE COURT: Well, what Mr.  
McCray is saying is  
23 go ahead and dismiss Case No. 17CV689. He's  
got the,  
24 he's timely on his new notice, and he is simply  
going to,  
25 when this case is dismissed, he's going to start  
another

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 18**

1 one. Because the municipality, you're going to  
have to  
2 consider the claim, the municipality is going to  
have to  
3 decide whether to grant it, deny it, talk to Mr.  
McCray  
4 about work something out or deny it, or if it is  
denied,  
5 then he starts his lawsuit. How much time  
does he have  
6 to start his lawsuit after that?

7           MR. ENGELKE: The city has 120  
days to respond  
8 to him in order to send a notice of disallowance,  
and if

9       they send a notice of disallowance, that  
shortens the  
10      statute of limitations to six months.

11       THE COURT:     Do you understand  
that?

12       MR. McCRAY:   Yes, I do.

13       THE COURT:     City has 120 days to  
disallow your  
14      claim.

15       MR. McCRAY:   Right.

16       THE COURT:     I'm not making a  
finding as to

17      when your claim was served. I'm accepting for  
purposes  
18      of this conversation what you told me is  
precisely

19      correct. I'm, I believe you. I'm not saying it's  
not

20      true, but there still could be errors in  
calculation; do

21      you follow what I'm saying that -

22       MR. McCRAY:   I understand.

23       THE COURT:     What you've told me  
is that you

24      had it served, you gave the notice, and that  
your clock

25      running backwards, your 120-day clock  
running backwards

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 19**

- 1 starts on September 28th. If that's true, it ends  
or
- 2 begins, depending on how you, because we're  
going back to
- 3 the future, if you will, it ends on May 31st. So
- 4 anything that's happened since on May 31st or  
since
- 5 May 31st, you've got a cause of action for.  
That's your
- 6 position.
- 7 Now, it could be because you brought a  
claim
- 8 for defamation, one of your claims is for  
defamation, you
- 9 have a lot, a lot of claims mixed up into this, it  
could
- 10 be that one of, one or more of your claims are  
now
- 11 eclipsed by virtue of the fact that they're  
outside of
- 12 that 120-day period, but maybe you've got  
something else
- 13 that's come in since because there's a  
continuing
- 14 grievance that you seem to be asserting here. I  
don't
- 15 know.

16           MR. McCRAY:    There is continuing  
                  violations.

17           THE COURT:     That's what I think  
                  you're saying.

18           MR. ENGELKE:    May I be heard real  
                  briefly, Your  
                  Honor?

19           THE COURT:     I'm inclined to grant  
                  the motion

20           to dismiss and then Mr. McCray is in the game  
                  to begin

21           with on his new approach. And what happens  
                  happens at

22           that point, Mr. McCray --

23           MR. McCRAY:    I understand.

24           MR. ENGELKE:    Frankly that's what  
                  I was going

**TRANSCRIPT; Case No. 2017CV689**

**Page 24**

1           They'll be scanned in and efiled. And I'm going  
                  to grant

2           this motion to dismiss without costs, counsel.

3           MR. ENGELKE:    Thank you, Your  
                  Honor.

4           MR. McCRAY:    Yes. Thank you,  
                  Your Honor.

5           MR. ENGELKE:   Would you like me to  
6            prepare an  
7            order?

8           THE COURT:    Yes. It's without  
9            costs, without  
10           prejudice.

11           MR. ENGELKE:  I'm sorry. You said  
12           without  
13           costs or did you say something different?

14           THE COURT:   I said without costs  
15           and without  
16           prejudice. Okay. Got it, Mr. McCray?

17           MR. McCRAY:   No. There's a lot  
18           missing from  
19           this.

20           THE COURT:   I'm talking about  
21           yours. You  
22           brought one in that you want to file today. You  
23           ought to  
24           know how many you have.

25           MR. McCRAY:   That's what I'm  
26           doing.

27           THE COURT:   Get it to the Clerk of  
28           Courts.  
29           We're going to staple it and have you state on  
30           the record  
31           how many pages there are and then I will  
32           adjourn.

22           MR. McCRAY:    That's what I'm  
              doing.

23           THE COURT:    Let's go. Numbering  
              those one

24           through 20 or 30 right down the road.

25           MR. McCRAY:    I'm going right down  
              the row.

**ORDER FOR DISMISSAL:** Case No. 17-CV-689

**Page 1**

**FILED  
11-01-2017  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Rock County, Wisconsin**

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ROCK  
C(illegible) BRANCH 4

---

RONALD McCRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-CV-689  
Case Code No. 30106

THE CITY OF BELOIT,

Defendants.

(Stamped): Received  
May 31, 2018  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

---

**ORDER FOR DISMISSAL**

---

This matter came on for a Motion Hearing on October 24, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., the Honorable Daniel T. Dillon presiding. Defendant City of Beloit by its attorneys, Stafford Rosenbaum, LLP, previously filed an Amended Notice and Motion to Dismiss on the basis that the plaintiff failed to comply with the notice requirements of Wis. Stat. § 893.80. Based on the parties' submissions, including the plaintiff's Withdrawal of Opposition to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, and the testimony and arguments received

by the Court on October 24, 2017, the Court rendered a ruling granting the motion and dismissing complaint for plaintiff's failure to comply with Wis. Stat § 893.80 and finding claims arising before May 31, 2017 are untimely pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 893.80.

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice and without costs to any party. This is a final order for purposes of appeal.

s/Electronically signed by Daniel T. Dillon

Circuit Court Judge

11/01/2017

(Sticker): **EXHIBIT**

#1 (attached to Defendants' "Notice of Motion to Dismiss Rock County Circuit Court Case No. 18-CV-421)

**TRANSCRIPT:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 1**

1 BRANCH 3  
2 STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT  
COURT ROCK COUNTY  
\*  
3 RONALD MCCRAY,  
4 Plaintiff,  
5 -vs-  
6 Case No. 18-CV-421  
7 CITY OF BELOIT, et al.,  
8 Defendant.

**COPY**

9 \*  
10 PROCEEDINGS: Motion Hearing  
11 DATE: August 3, 2018  
12 COURT: Circuit Court, Branch 3  
13 Hon. Jeffrey S. Kuglitsch,  
Judge  
14 APPEARANCES: Ronald McCray,  
Plaintiff  
15 appearing pro se;  
16 Kyle W. Engelke,  
17 Attorney at Law,  
appearing for the  
defendants.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Mical Barkley, RPR, CRR  
25 Circuit Court Reporter

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 2**

1                   TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
2                   THE COURT: Next case this morning is  
3                   2018-CV-421, Ronald McCray versus City of  
                  Beloit, et al.  
4                   And appearance, please. Your're Mr. McCray?  
5                   MR. MCCRAY:    Yes, acting pro se.  
6                   THE COURT:    Very good.  
7                   MR. ENGELKE:   Good morning, Your  
                  Honor. My name  
8                   is Kyle Engelke appearing on behalf of the  
                  defendants.  
9                   THE COURT:    Okay. And Mr.  
                  Engelke, it's your  
10                  motion to dismiss. And I'll indicate that I've  
                  read  
11                  through the complaint and read through the  
                  motion and  
12                  I've read through the response. But what  
                  argument do

13 you want to make, sir?

14 MR. ENGELKE: No, I'd like to start  
by just

15 emphasizing we have a very long complaint,  
and we have

16 been here before with Mr. McCray in front of a  
judge on

17 a motion to dismiss. And it was in regards to  
some

18 procedural issues regarding 893.80 that was  
granted last

19 fall by Judge Dillon, and I think, as was  
attached to

20 the motion, I want to emphasize the court  
rendered a

21 ruling dismissing the complaint and finding  
that the

22 plaintiff's failure to comply with 893.80 for  
claims

23 arising before May 31st, 2017. So I think that's  
a fact

24 that's established by that prior decision.

25 So since then, Mr. McCray has filed  
additional

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 3**

1 notices of claim, and I think they all trace back  
to one

2 incident back in February of 2017. And what  
I'd like to  
3 do is mark for the record the exhibit that Mr.  
McCray  
4 offered to Judge Dillon back in October just so  
you can  
5 have it in front of you what we've been talking  
about.

6 You didn't want a copy?

7 MR. MCCRAY: I have copies.

8 THE COURT: Mr. McCray, you  
understand what he's  
9 asking to be marked?

10 MR. MCCRAY: I understand what  
he's asking to be  
11 marked, but he's omitting a lot of information.

12 THE COURT: You'll get your  
chance to have your  
13 say.

14 MR. MCCRAY: I understand.

15 MR. ENGELKE: So may I approach?

16 THE COURT: You may.

17 MR. ENGELKE: So, Your Honor,  
what's been marked  
18 as Exhibit 1 both in this case and also the prior  
case  
19 in front of Judge Dillon is something that Mr.  
McCray

20 submitted as his rep -- he says that this is a  
21 procedural complaint report. I don't really  
need to  
22 characterize it other than to draw the court's  
23 attention, I believe it is, the fifth page. And  
when I  
24 say the fifth page, I realize it's copied on both  
sides.  
25 So the fifth page that starts with Incident  
Report

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 4**

1 Supplement. And at the top right, it is March  
3rd. Do  
2 you have that?  
3 THE COURT: Okay. Just a second. All  
right.  
4 It's the page that says Supplement, and it says  
No. 9 at  
5 the bottom of the page there?  
6 MR. ENGELKE: Yes, Your Honor.  
7 THE COURT: Okay.  
8 MR. ENGELKE: And so there's much  
dispute on  
9 what exactly to call this document. All I'll say  
is

10 that this is what led to this lawsuit. And so I  
11 don't  
12 want to get into the facts because they're very  
13 heavily  
14 disputed apparently, but I would just point out  
15 to the  
16 fact that the disposition that this was that  
17 retrieved  
18 the item, which was the list of patients from  
19 this  
20 dental office, that apparently reported that he  
21 -- Mr. McCray was contacting folks and there  
22 was no  
23 action taken by the police officers. So that's  
24 how the  
25 contact ended back in February of 2017. Why  
26 that didn't  
27 constitute the end of it is not clear to me, even  
28 here  
29 today. But the basis of the motion by the  
30 defendants is  
31 that there's not a claim here for defamation.  
32 And they  
33 have – there's a failure to comply with 893.80  
34 because,  
35 As you will see in the top right corner, that  
36 document,  
37 March 3rd, 2017, that was received and  
38 comparing that to

25 the order from Judge Dillon, which said action  
arising

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 5**

1 before May 31, 2017 are too late.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 Mr. Engelke: And so I'm guessing  
there will be

4 some back and forth here today, but frankly,  
you know,

5 how this document that I'm -- page -- the fifth  
page,

6 the March 3rd, 2017 received document that I  
was

7 referencing constitutes defamatory statements  
from any

8 of the defendants, you know, is certainly a basis  
of the

9 motion to dismiss this complaint because it's  
just not

10 capable of defaming. So that's where I'll start  
and,

11 you know, happy to respond what – whatever  
questions

12 you may have or issues are raised.

13 THE COURT: All right.  
Well, and I was familiar

14 with Judge Dillon because it's been referenced  
15 in some  
16 other documents here, too. Between you and  
17 Mr. McCray  
18 presented, were there – and what I understood  
19 the  
20 previous case – that's what, the case number  
21 17-CV-689,  
22 that Mr. McCray then did follow up in  
23 September of that  
24 year with a new notice of claim?

25 MR. ENGELKE: That's correct,  
Your Honor.

26 THE COURT: And did the  
27 City respond back or  
28 deny that claim or take no action?

29 MR. ENGELKE: I believe the  
30 City took no action,  
31 so the period expired.

32 THE COURT: The 120 days,  
I understand that.

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 6**

1 Okay. Mr. McCray, what do you want to tell  
2 me, sir?

3 MR. MCCRAY: Your Honor,  
that statute of

3 limitations that the defendant's attorney is  
referring

4 to, this police department, they concealed  
evidence.

5 THE COURT: What did they  
conceal, sir?

6 MR. McCRAY: They  
concealed that Officer

7 Daugherty filed his report defaming my  
character as a

8 copy of CAD notes. He did not disclose that he  
filed

9 his report as a copy of the CAD notes. He  
altered the

10 CAD notes in his report and he changed it to --

11 THE COURT: How were you  
defamed, sir?

12 MR. MCCRAY: I'm defamed  
because he is stating

13 that I was making harassing phone calls to  
patients, and

14 that is not what I was doing.

15 THE COURT: He was  
stating that or the complaint

16 that was filed was stating that?

17 MR. MCCRAY: He was  
stating it. That was his

18 -- that was his -- the complaint -- his report is

19 actually a copy of this -- this complaint. And he  
was  
20 called in to investigate it, and he did not state  
the  
21 truth.

22 THE COURT: And no  
charges were brought against  
23 you, sir, correct?

24 MR. MCCRAY: No charges  
were brought against me,  
25 no, but they -

**TRANSCRIPT:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 7**

1 THE COURT: So how are  
you defamed?

2 MR. MCCRAY: They were  
continuing - the police

3 chief wrote a defamatory letter of response. He  
accused

4 me of lying. He accused me of withholding --

5 THE COURT: All right.  
We'll let you get into

6 more in a little second, okay? But the first  
issue that

7 was raised by Mr. Engelke here was the 893.80.  
And

8 basically the entire substance of your complain  
stems

9 back to the February incident here that's  
referenced on

10 page 5 of this document, basically the initial –  
the

11 initial action back when the – you found the  
paper

12 -- whatever that paperwork was, and then that  
got

13 reported to the police and they investigated  
back in

14 February and this document is dated March  
3rd, which is

15 clearly before the May 31st deadline that Judge  
Dillon

16 had indicated regarding 893.80. How do you  
deal with

17 that, sir, when basically all the items that  
you're

18 alleging stem from this February incident?

19 MR. MCCRAY: Because a cause  
of action accrues

20 when there exists a claim capable of  
enforcement. The

21 police chief told me I didn't have a claim. I  
filed a

22 complaint with the district attorney. They told  
me I

23 did not – there was no police misconduct. He  
even said  
24 it. I discovered these CAD notes – Officer  
Daugherty  
25 did not state it was unlawful for him to file this

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 8**

1 report as CAD notes because these CAD notes -  
2 THE COURT: How is it  
unlawful for him to file a  
3 report?  
4 MR. MCCRAY: Because  
without – without stating  
5 the truth because these CAD notes contains a  
false  
6 statement in them.  
7 THE COURT: All right.  
8 MR. MCCRAY: And so that's  
a false statement  
9 defaming my character. I was not calling,  
harassing  
10 anyone. That's what these CAD notes state,  
and Officer  
11 Daugherty's report –  
12 THE COURT: Well, isn't the  
fact they didn't

13 charge you anything proof that you didn't  
harass  
14 anybody?  
15 MR. MCCRAY: No, because  
they filed their  
16 reports stating that these CAD notes that I was  
actually  
17 doing that. That's what they filed their report  
as.  
18 Officer Daugherty filed his report as these Cad  
notes  
19 without disclosing that he changed the CAD  
notes. He  
20 changed the actual facts, and I think if you  
want me to  
21 go through and show you what he changed, I  
can do that  
22 also.  
23 THE COURT: Well, let's get  
back to my question  
24 though. My question was, isn't this action all  
stem out  
25 from the February incident? That's your date  
that

**TRANSCRIPT:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 9**

1 things happened. And that's the argument  
that says

2 you're not timely in the sense that, you know,  
this was  
3 an incident that occurred before May 31st and  
-- when  
4 were the CAD notes reported?

5 MR. MCCRAY: I found – I got  
these --- they  
6 didn't tell me.

7 THE COURT: I'm not asking  
you – okay. When  
8 did you find them?

9 MR. MCCRAY: I found the  
CAD notes on June 9th.

10 That's when I discovered the CAD notes. And  
how I  
11 discovered them is that I requested – actually, I  
first  
12 -- on May 30th, I requested a copy of all the  
reports  
13 and investigations from the Beloit Police  
Department.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. MCCRAY: Jillian  
Peterson, the director of  
16 support services, and the chief of police stated  
that  
17 were no investigations. They stated that there  
were no

18 documents other than the two reports that I  
received.  
19 And then I did some investigating myself, and I  
asked  
20 for a copy of the 911 call that was called in.  
21 THE COURT: All right. So  
you asked for 911  
notes from the County.  
22  
23 MR. MCCRAY: From the  
Rock County Communication  
24 Center, yes.  
25 THE COURT: That's not the  
City of Beloit,

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page10**

1 though.  
2 MR. MCCRAY: That's not the  
City of Beloit, but  
3 that's what this officer filed his report as. This  
4 report is from the Rock County communication  
Center.  
5 THE COURT: Okay.  
6 MR. MCCRAY: So he filed the  
City of Beloit  
7 police report as a copy of this report. And -

8                   THE COURT:     Well, let's see  
- what report are  
9                   you referring to, sir? I'm not sure.  
10                  MR. MCCRAY:    I'm reporting  
to -I'm  
11                  reporting -  
12                  THE COURT:     Can I see it?  
13                  MR. MCCRAY:    See, that's  
what Mr. Engelke didn't  
14                  give you. This is -  
15                  THE COURT:     Can I see the  
document?  
16                  MR. MCCRAY:    Yes.  
17                  THE COURT:     Give it to my  
bailiff here. We'll  
18                  mark it.  
19                  MR. MCCRAY:    This is what  
his -  
20                  THE COURT:     Hang on.  
21                  MR. MCCRAY;    Yes, okay.  
22                  MR. ENGELKE:   Do you have  
an extra copy.  
23                  Mr. McCray?  
24                  MR. MCCRAY:    No, I don't. I  
gave you a copy  
25                  back in October.

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 25**

1                   MR. MCCRAY:    The  
2                   PremierOne report –  
3                   they withheld that – was discovered on June  
4                   9th.

5                   THE COURT:     it's not their  
6                   record. It's a CAD  
7                   report from the County.

8                   MR. MCcRAY:    But he filed  
9                   his report of this CAD  
10                  record, a copy of it. And he did not disclose  
11                  that in  
12                  his report. He filed his report as a copy of  
13                  these CAD  
14                  notes. If you look at this procedural complaint  
15                  report  
16                  that Mr. Engelke gave you, if you look page 1,  
17                  2, 3, 4  
18                  -- if you look page 6, that last page of this  
19                  report.

20                  THE COURT:     This is Exhibit  
21                  1 we're talking?

22                  MR. MCCRAY:    Yes. Exhibit  
23                  1.

24                  THE COURT:     The last page  
25                  of Exhibit 1?

26                  MR. MCCRAY;    That's correct.

15                   MR. ENGELKE: Well, that's  
16                   going to be a little  
17                   bit different – sorry to interrupt, Mr. McCray –  
18                   because I had front and side – front and back.  
19                   So  
20                   Exhibit 1, yeah, it's going to be the same. I  
21                   think  
22                   it's going to be the one that is – it's the fourth  
23                   page, Your Honor. It's titled 4/12/17 at the  
24                   very top  
25                   left. You agree with that, Mr. McCray?  
22                   MR. MCCRAY: Yes.  
23                   THE COURT: Okay.  
24                   MR. MCCRAY: If you look  
25                   where it says  
                    Information disseminated.

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 28**

1                   in. It's no different than before.  
2                   MR. MCCRAY: Unknown how  
3                   he got the paperwork.  
4                   Then it gives an incident date.  
5                   THE COURT: Mm-hmm.  
6                   MR. MCCRAY: 2/23/17.  
7                   THE COURT: Right.

7                   MR. MCCRAY:   And then it  
goes on to repeat this  
8                   statement a second time.

9                   THE COURT:    Mm-hmm.

10                  MR. MCCRAY:   Without this  
incident date.

11                  THE COURT:    Okay.

12                  MR. MCCRAY:   And then  
unknown how he got the  
13                  paperwork. If he had all of the information  
regarding  
14                  this incident before he wrote this report, I  
don't  
15                  understand why he is entering this false – this  
false  
16                  statement in his report.

17                  THE COURT:    And what's  
the false statement, that  
18                  you're harassing?

19                  MR. MCCRAY:   That I was  
harassing,, calling  
20                  patients.

21                  THE COURT:    And again,  
that was called in by the  
22                  dentist's office sir. That's not his statement.  
23                  That's the assignment he got.

24                  MR. MCCRAY:   Okay.

25                  THE COURT:    All right.

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 29**

1                   MR. MCCRAY:    He got that  
2                   assignment, but that  
3                   only appears once in this PremiereOne report.  
4                   He has  
5                   put it in there twice. So he's framing me. He's  
6                   putting this in to make it sound like this  
7                   statement is  
8                   true. Because –

9                   THE COURT:      I don't see  
10                  that, sir. I don't see that at all.

11                  MR. MCCRAY:     First he put it  
12                  in with the  
13                  incident date and time. Then he put it in  
14                  without an  
15                  incident date and time and then called suspect.  
16                  What am  
17                  I a suspect of if he had all this information?

18                  THE COURT:      I think we've  
19                  already established  
20                  that, sir. When the dentist office called, they  
21                  complained about you.

22                  MR. MCCRAY:     I understand  
23                  that.

24                  THE COURT:      All right. So  
25                  at that point, you

18 were a suspect. All right? I understand why it  
was put  
19 in the CAD notes that way. I don't believe the  
officer  
20 did that. I believe that's the way the CAD  
system  
21 operates. And it's an unfortunate choice of  
words. I'm  
22 sorry for that. But ultimately you were cleared  
of any  
23 wrongdoing. They didn't file any charges  
against you.  
24 MR. MCCRAY: That doesn't  
mean that I was  
25 cleared of any wrongdoing.

**TRANSCRIPT:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 31**

1 Department report. This - this - they stated --  
2 THE COURT: All right.  
3 MR. MCCRAY: -- that the 911  
dispatcher put this  
4 statement in their report.  
5 THE COURT: All right.  
Let's get back to again  
6 the 893.80, we keep getting off track there. I'm  
sorry

7 for that, Mr. Engelke. As far as the 893.80,  
again,

8 we're still looking at documents that are before  
the May

9 31st deadline when you filed your notice of  
claim in

10 September

11 MR. MCCRAY: Okay. Can  
you give me a second to

12 find--

13 THE COURT: Absolutely.  
Take all the time you

14 need , sir.

15 MR. MCCRAY: my copy of  
this. I

16 -- with my dispute in opposition to defendant's  
motion

17 to dismiss, I fileld a copy.

18 THE COURT: Okay. This is  
your response – hang

19 on a second. Let's see here. So this is your

20 opposition to the motion to dismiss disputed  
statements

21 filed on 6/7 of this year.

22 MR. MCCRAY: And wilth that  
dispute, I filed a

23 copy of my genuine dispute of statement and  
false

24 statements and tampered with evidence, and  
defendant

25 City of Beloit's amended notice and motion to  
dismiss

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 49**

1 original -- or the document received May 3rd,  
2017 that

2 is the genesis of all this. I don't understand  
about,

3 you know, somebody supplied one report or  
another

4 report. The point is he knew on March 3rd of  
2017 that

5 He was upset about this -- this issue and  
report.

6                   THE COURT:     Anything else  
there, Mr. McCray?

7                   MR. MCCRAY:    Yeah, I did not  
know --

8                   THE COURT:     First of all, let  
me rule. First of  
9 all, I am not going to admit the document -- or  
the  
10 recording at this point. I've got no way to hear  
it,  
11 and it's really not fair to do it. It's alleged for

12 statements for a party that's not here, and I do  
believe  
13 that is hearsay at this point. And as such, I'll  
take  
14 Mr. McCray's word for what he says it says. All  
right?

15 MR. MCCRAY: Yes.

16 THE COURT: Okay.  
Anything else you want to  
17 tell me, Mr. McCray?

18 MR. MCCRAY: I think that's  
about it outside of  
19 the inconsistencies in this procedural complaint  
report.

20 THE COURT: All right.  
Anything else,  
21 Mr. Engelke?

22 MR. ENGELKE: The only -- I  
think I made clear  
23 my record on what I'm requesting today for  
factual  
24 findings, but I think we should, depending on  
the  
28 court's ruling, make a record that there was  
nine

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 50**

1 counts, and I want to make sure -- I believe all  
of

2 these relate to defamation, but I want to make  
a clear

3 record.

4 THE COURT: All right.  
Very good. All right.

8 Well, I'm being asked to decide whether or not  
to

9 dismiss this complaint. And again, I  
understand that

10 Mr. McCray is acting pro se, and I will note I  
think

11 he's doing a very good job at it.

12 As far as the request for a motion to dismiss,  
13 basically then I've got to look at that in the  
light

14 most favorable to the nonmoving party, and  
that would be

15 Mr. McCray. So if there's any basis at all from  
16 Mr. McCray's complaint to go forward, I  
basically need

17 to rule in his favor at this early stage of the  
18 proceeding. I'm being asked by the defendants  
here to

19 throw this matter out based on 893.80. And  
part of this  
20 has already been litigated before by Judge  
Dillon in  
21 previous case 17-CV-689. And Judge Dillon  
made a ruling  
22 that does stand up that anything prior to May  
31st is  
23 pretty much not timely. And as I take a look at  
this  
24 situation here, pretty much everything relates  
back to  
25 an incident that occurred on 2/23/17 at  
approximately

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 53**

1 that way. And that's what's indicated on that  
March 3rd  
2 document that you're concerned about. So it's  
not the  
3 officer that's making the statement of  
harassment. So  
4 as such, I don't think there's a false statement.  
It's  
5 in a document. It's not unprivileged. And it's  
6 certainly not meant to harm reputation. It was  
just –

7 I understand you don't like being called a suspect and I  
8 understand that and maybe it's a poor choice of words,  
9 but at that point when they're investigating, they have  
10 a name and at that point they called you a suspect.  
11 unfortunately. But ultimately, as - - as you complained,  
12 they did a supplemental report and ultimately found that  
13 no crime had been committed. You had never been  
14 charged. You know, I don't know how readily available  
15 the CAD notes are. Certainly they could be a public  
16 record and somebody could make that, but normally most  
17 people go after complaints and things out of the DA's  
18 office and very seldom would you get CAD note requests.  
19 But it's possible. But again, ultimately, if you got  
20 the review of the paperwork, etcetera, ultimately it was  
21 - - the investigation found there was no crime committed

22 nor was there any violation of local ordinance.  
23 So I don't believe you proved your case for  
24 defamation. I don't think you can prove your  
case for  
25 defamation, as such

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 54**

1 MR. MCCRAY: May I make  
statement?  
2 THE COURT: It's my turn to  
talk, sir. You've  
3 had your chance.  
4 So as it relates to the 893.80 claim, as I said,  
I  
5 believe everything does tend to go back to the  
initial  
6 incident back in February, which is barred by  
the  
7 statute of limitations at this point. In addition,  
your  
8 concern about the public records request, I  
asked you,  
9 too, if you felt that the - - if you filed a writ of  
10 mandamus, which the City properly informed  
you pursuant  
11 to statute that you had a right if you didn't feel  
you

12 were getting the right answers to file, and you  
13 indicated you didn't do that. So as far as that  
goes, I  
14 don't see a violation there either.  
15 Again, the other documents you provided  
here between  
16 Exhibits 2 - - you tried to make a big thing out  
of the  
17 CAD notes and that it went on for two hours. I  
believe  
18 it probably did go on for two hours. The note  
that's  
19 referenced in the police report is the time the  
call  
20 came in. And that's the time it was reported.  
And then  
21 you try to make an issue that they doctored the  
report.  
22 Well, it was supplemental report, and as such, a  
23 supplemental report is not the same report as  
the  
24 initial report. So they're going to be different.  
And  
25 I believe that the City has at least made efforts  
to try

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 55**

1 to accommodate you.

2 Sir, I believe you felt you were wronged and I

3 understand your concerns, but I don't believe,

4 looking

5 at the evidence here, that the City or its

officers have

6 done anything that's defaming to you. And as

such

7 - - and as far as the other incidents in your

complaints,

8 you allege felony charges and things.

Obviously that's

9 for the district attorney or whoever to

investigate, but

10 you didn't present any further evidence as it

relates to

11 any of the other complaints when it was

specifically

12 asked by counsel here if we wanted to address

any of the

13 other issues. So no evidence has been provided

on any

14 of those other counts. As such, I believe that

the

evidence here is clear and convincing that you

haven't

15 met your burden, and that the appropriate --  
the request  
16 to dismiss this action is appropriate. I don't  
believe,  
17 even looking at any light most favorable to Mr.  
McCray,  
18 that there's any basis for him to succeed in his  
lawsuit  
19 here. And as such, I'm going to grant the  
City's  
20 request to dismiss this action.

21 MR. McCRAY: Can I ask one  
question, Your Honor?

22 THE COURT: You can.

23 MR. MCCRAY: When the  
information was given to  
24 the police and fire commission, they are  
required by law  
25 to investigate -- or to hold a hearing on this  
matter,

**TRANSCRIPT: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 56**

1 and I have the actual statute which states that.  
2 THE COURT: All right. Sir,  
the time for  
3 evidence in the matter and presentation is  
over. I

4       asked you on two occasions whether there was  
5       anything  
6       else and you indicated no. So your request now  
7       is not  
8       timely. Mr. Engelke, anything else you need?

9                    MR. ENGELKE: No. I was  
10      going to prepare an  
11      order.

12                   THE COURT: I was going to  
13      ask you to prepare  
14      the order.

15                   MR. ENGELKE: And I'm  
16      happy to do so. And yeah,  
17      I guess I'll follow up and, you know, prepare a  
18      bill of  
19      costa as well, and the court can review it and  
20      Mr. McCray will have an opportunity to object,  
21      so.

22                   THE COURT: All right.  
23      That's it for today.

24                   MR. ENGELKE: Thank you.

25                   MR. MCCRAY: Thank you.

26      (Proceedings concluded.)

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL  
OF ALL CLAIMS: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 1 of 4**

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ROCK  
COUNTY

---

[Stamped]: Received  
Aug 06, 2018  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

RONALD McCRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-CV-421

Code: 30107

THE CITY OF BELOIT, DAVID B.  
ZIBOLSKI, CHIEF OF POLICE, CAPTAIN  
DAN RISSE, SGT EDMUND GATES and  
OFFICER KERRY DAUGHERTY,

Defendants.

---

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL OF  
ALL CLAIMS**

---

This matter came on for a Motion Hearing on August 3, 2018 at 10:00 a.m., the Honorable Jeffrey Kuglitsch presiding. Defendants City of Beloit, et al. (“City Defendants”), by their attorneys, Stafford Rosenbaum, LLP, previously filed a Motion to Dismiss on the basis that the plaintiff failed to comply with

the notice requirements of Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and/or failed to state claim. Based on the prior pleadings, proceedings, and the evidence and arguments presented during the Motion Hearing on August 3, 2018, the Court rendered a ruling granting the motion and dismissing the Complaint for plaintiff's failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and for failure to state a claim. In support of its ruling, the Court made the following factual determinations:

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL  
OF ALL CLAIMS:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 2 of 4**

- 1) The plaintiff's claims of defamation arose no later than March 3, 2017 making the present claims untimely based on Jude Dillon's prior Order for Dismissal dated November 1, 2017;
- 2) The plaintiff failed to show both that there was actual notice of a claim before May 31, 2017 and that there was a lack of prejudice for failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80;
- 3) Finally, in light of the evidence offered, there was no statement made by the City Defendants capable of a defamatory meaning.

The Court further ruled that the plaintiff failed to provide either legal or factual support for any of the remaining claims set forth in the Complaint.

The City Defendants have agreed to dismiss this case without costs in exchange for the plaintiff

waiving his right to appeal and releasing any claim, known or unknown, against the City of Beloit or its agents and/or officials (including, but not limited to, the individuals referenced in ¶ 129 of the Complaint) that in anyway arises or relates to the allegations in the Complaint and/or the complaint made against Mr. McCray on February 23, 2017.

Thus, all the above-captioned parties, by their respective counsel, stipulate that all claims made by the plaintiff may be dismissed with prejudice, without further notice or hearing, and without costs to any party. This agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same document. Any counterpart may be delivered by facsimile or other form of electronic transmission and the delivery of a copy or digital image of an executed original or counterpart shall have the same force and effect as the delivery of an executed original.

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL  
OF ALL CLAIMS:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 3 of 4**

Dated: August \_\_, 2018      Ronald McCray  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald McCray

Dated: August \_\_, 2018      STAFFORD ROSENBAUM  
LLP  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
Ted Waskowski

State Bar Number 1003254  
Kyle W. Engelke State Bar  
Number 1088993  
Attorneys for Defendants  
Defendants

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL  
OF ALL CLAIMS:** Case No. 18-CV-421

**Page 4 of 4**

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ROCK  
COUNTY

---

RONALD McCRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-CV-421

Code: 30107

THE CITY OF BELOIT, DAVID B.  
ZIBOLSKI, CHIEF OF POLICE, CAPTAIN  
DAN RISSE, SGT EDMUND GATES and  
OFFICER KERRY DAUGHERTY,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER FOR DISMISSAL OF ALL CLAIMS**

---

Based upon the foregoing stipulation,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

That the Court enters this Order based on the factual findings contained in the parties' stipulation and order for dismissal, and that all claims between the above-captioned parties are dismissed with prejudice, on the merits and without costs to any party.

BY THE COURT:

(**Proposed Order of Dismissal; Case No. 18-CV-421**/ please note: the word "Proposed" is not written on the following proposed order)

**Page 1 of 2**

[Stamped]: Received  
Aug 24, 2018  
By: s/ Ronald McCray

[Court Stamp]: Received 08-22-2018

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ROCK COUNTY

---

RONALD McCRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-CV-421

Code: 30107

THE CITY OF BELOIT, DAVID B.  
ZIBOLSKI, CHIEF OF POLICE, CAPTAIN  
DAN RISSE, SGT EDMUND GATES and  
OFFICER KERRY DAUGHERTY,

Defendants.

---

## ORDER OF DISMISSAL

---

This matter came on for a Motion Hearing on August 3, 2018 before the Honorable Jeffrey Kuglitsch. Defendants City of Beloit, et al. ("City Defendants"), by their attorneys, Stafford Rosenbaum, LLP, previously filed a Motion to Dismiss ("Motion") on the basis that the plaintiff failed to comply with the notice requirements of Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and/or failed to state claim. Based on the prior pleadings, proceedings, and the evidence and arguments presented during the Motion Hearing, the Court rendered a ruling granting the motion and dismissing the Complaint for plaintiff's failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and for failure to state a claim. In support of its ruling, the Court made the following factual determinations:

L:\DOCS\008462\000067\ORDER\3HE8388.DOC  
0822180852

**Proposed Order of Dismissal; Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 2 of 2**

- 1) The plaintiff's claims of defamation arose no later than March 3, 2017 making the present claims untimely based on Jude Dillon's prior Order for Dismissal dated November 1, 2017;
- 2) The plaintiff failed to show both that there was actual notice of a claim before May 31, 2017 and

that there was a lack of prejudice for failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80;

- 3) Finally, in light of the evidence offered, there was no statement made by the City Defendants capable of a defamatory meaning.

The Court further ruled that the plaintiff failed to provide either legal or factual support for any of the remaining claims set forth in the Complaint.

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that all claims made by the plaintiff are dismissed with prejudice, without further notice or hearing, and that the City of Beloit may recover costs from the plaintiffs as provided by statute.

This is a final order for purposes of appeal.

BY THE COURT:

L:\DOCS\008462\000067\ORDER\3HE8388.DOC  
0822180852

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL: Case No. 18-CV-421**

**Page 1 of 2**

[Court Stamp]: Received 08-22-2018

FILED

08-24-2018

Clerk of Circuit Court

Rock County, Wisconsin

2018CV000421

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT ROCK  
COUNTY

---

RONALD McCRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-CV-421

Code: 30107

THE CITY OF BELOIT, DAVID B.  
ZIBOLSKI, CHIEF OF POLICE, CAPTAIN  
DAN RISSE, SGT EDMUND GATES and  
OFFICER KERRY DAUGHERTY,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

---

This matter came on for a Motion Hearing on August 3, 2018 before the Honorable Jeffrey Kuglitsch. Defendants City of Beloit, et al. ("City Defendants"), by their attorneys, Stafford Rosenbaum, LLP, previously filed a Motion to Dismiss ("Motion") on the basis that the plaintiff failed to comply with the notice requirements of Wis. Stat. §

893.80 and/or failed to state claim. Based on the prior pleadings, proceedings, and the evidence and arguments presented during the Motion Hearing, the Court rendered a ruling granting the motion and dismissing the Complaint for plaintiff's failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80 and for failure to state a claim. In support of its ruling, the Court made the following factual determinations:

L:\DOCS\008462\000067\ORDER\3HE8388.DOC  
0822180852

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL: Case No. 18-CV-421**  
**Page 2 of 2**

- 1) The plaintiff's claims of defamation arose no later than March 3, 2017 making the present claims untimely based on Jude Dillon's prior Order for Dismissal dated November 1, 2017;
- 2) The plaintiff failed to show both that there was actual notice of a claim before May 31, 2017 and that there was a lack of prejudice for failure to comply with Wis. Stat. § 893.80;
- 3) Finally, in light of the evidence offered, there was no statement made by the City Defendants capable of a defamatory meaning.

The Court further ruled that the plaintiff failed to provide either legal or factual support for any of the remaining claims set forth in the Complaint.

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that all claims made by the plaintiff are dismissed with prejudice, without

APP-81

further notice or hearing, and that the City of Beloit  
may recover costs from the plaintiffs as provided by  
statute.

This is a final order for purposes of appeal.

BY THE COURT:

s/Electronically signed by Jeffrey S. Kuglitsch

Circuit Court Judge

08/23/2018

L:\DOCS\008462\000067\ORDER\3HE8388.DOC  
0822180852