

APPENDIX A

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SEVENTH CIRCUIT**

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER
April 10, 2024
By the Court:
No. 23-2418

KRISTIN BAUSCH,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

JACOB FROST, et al.,

Defendants - Appellees

Originating Case Information:
District Court No: 3:23-cv-00061-jdp
Western District of Wisconsin
District Judge James D. Peterson

**Upon consideration of the APPELLANT'S MOTION TO
RECALL THE MANDATE TO REOPEN CASE AFTER
FINAL JUDGMENT TO FILE TIMELY FILED PAPERS**

FORM PLAINTIFF, filed on April 3, 2024, by the pro se
appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

APPENDIX B

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Submitted January 31, 2024*
Decided January 31, 2024

Before
ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, Circuit Judge
DIANE P. WOOD, Circuit Judge
DAVID F. HAMILTON, Circuit Judge
No. 23-2418

KRISTIN BAUSCH,
Plaintiff-Appellant,
v.
JACOB FROST, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Western District of
Wisconsin.
No. 23-cv-61-jdp
James D. Peterson,
Chief Judge.
O R D E R

Kristin Bausch sued a Wisconsin judge, a guardian ad litem, and county workers who are involved in her ongoing state case, alleging that the judge did not permit her to oppose an order to garnish from her wages unpaid child support payments. The district * We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal

arguments, and oral argument would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1
Case: 23-2418 Document: 23 Filed: 01/31/2024 Pages: 2
No. 23-2418 Page 2

court dismissed the case on numerous grounds. We affirm the dismissal based on the requirement that we abstain from interfering in an ongoing family-court proceeding. Bausch alleges that during her divorce proceedings, a state judge issued a temporary order that she pay child support. When she did not pay, the court held a contempt hearing and ordered Bausch's employer to garnish her wages. According to Bausch, at the hearing she was unable to oppose to her satisfaction the garnishment order. As a result, she turned to federal district court, invoking 42 U.S.C. § 1983. She contends in this suit that the wage garnishment violated federal criminal statutes and her constitutional rights.

The district court granted the defendants' motions to dismiss. It dismissed her attempt to enforce criminal statutes because she lacked authority to invoke them. As for the § 1983 claims, the court identified several obstacles: absolute immunity; abstention under *J.B. v. Woodard*, 997 F.3d 714, 722 (7th Cir. 2021) (barring federal courts from adjudicating claims that would interfere with ongoing domestic disputes in state court); the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, see *District of Columbia Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), *Rooker v. Fidelity Tr. Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); and the domestic-relations exception to federal jurisdiction. *Ankenbrandt v. Richards*, 504 U.S. 689, 703 (1992). On

appeal, Bausch contests these conclusions. When a district court has identified numerous threshold issues that defeat a case, the appellate court may pick from among them to affirm. *Sinochem Int'l Co. Ltd. v. Malaysia Int'l Shipping Corp.*, 549 U.S. 422, 431 (2007); *Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 584 (1999). We do so here. Bausch argues that Rooker-Feldman does not apply because the state court has not yet issued a final order. But by confirming that her state-court case is still ongoing, she must lose on abstention grounds. Woodard holds that the comity, equity, and federalism principles underlying the abstention doctrines require federal courts to abstain from federal cases that would interfere with ongoing state-court domestic proceedings. 97 F.3d at 722, 724. Bausch tells us that in her ongoing state-court domestic proceeding, she continues to contest the constitutionality of its contempt hearing and garnishment order. We thus must allow that state case to proceed without our interference. See *id.* at 722–23. We have reviewed Bausch's remaining arguments, and none has merit.

AFFIRMED

APPENDIX C

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

KRISTIN BAUSCH,
Plaintiff,

v.

**JACOB FROST, JASON HANSON, EMILY WILSON,
JANE JACOBS, LISA BINA, NANCY HAACK,
JENNIFER COOKE, and CRISCILDA CHAIREZ,**
Defendants.

OPINION and ORDER
23-cv-61-jdp

Pro se plaintiff Kristin Bausch brought this lawsuit against a judge, a guardian ad litem, and six Dane County employees, contending that defendants violated her rights when they denied her a chance to challenge a garnishment order in a state court family law case. Defendants have filed motions to dismiss. I will grant the motions and the case will be dismissed because defendants are entitled to immunity for their work in a state court family law matter.

BACKGROUND

Defendants filed motions to dismiss after Bausch submitted her complaint. Bausch then filed an amended complaint that is essentially identical to her original complaint. Bausch alleges the following facts in her amended complaint, which I accept as true for purposes of evaluating defendants' motions to dismiss.

Bausch is the petitioner in a divorce case in Dane County Circuit Court. In re the marriage of Kristin Anne Bausch and Christopher John Bausch, No. 2021FA822. Defendant Jacob Frost presided over the case. After issuing a temporary order regarding custody and child support,

2

the court held a contempt hearing and sent a garnishment form to Bausch's employer in October 2022. Bausch alleges that all defendants failed to respond to the documents she submitted in that hearing. She contends that, as a result, she was not able to challenge the garnishment. Bausch alleges that the defendants infringed her constitutional rights to due process and have violated several federal criminal statutes, and she states that she has suffered "significant distress, anxiety, and financial injury including wage garnishment and loss of income." Dkt. 19, at 2. There are three sets of defendants in this case: (1) Judge Frost, who presided over the state case; (2) Emily Wilson, a guardian ad litem appointed by the state court to represent the best interests of the child; and (3) county employees Jason Hanson, Nancy Haack, Lisa Bina, Jennifer Cooke, Criscilda Chairez and Jane Jacobs. Hanson is a court commissioner. The other defendants work for the Dane

County child support agency. Cooke and Jacobs are child support attorneys. Chairez is a child support investigator. Haack is a child support director. Bina is a child support operations director.

ANALYSIS

A. Defendant Frost

Defendant Frost moves to dismiss the claims against him because the claims are barred by judicial immunity and the Eleventh Amendment. I will grant his motion. Bausch alleges that Frost violated her due process rights by not allowing her to challenge the garnishment. If Bausch is suing Frost in his official capacity, her claims are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. See *Brokaw v. Mercer Cnty.*, 235 F.3d 1000, 1009 (7th Cir. 2000) (federal suits for damages against state officials in their official capacities are barred by Eleventh

3

Amendment sovereign immunity). If Bausch is suing Frost in his individual capacity, her claims are barred by the doctrine of judicial immunity because Bausch is complaining about Frost's judicial conduct. See *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 359 (1978); *Loubser v. Thacker*, 440 F.3d 439, 442 (7th Cir. 2006) (judges have absolute immunity for damages claims based on judicial conduct). Moreover, Bausch cannot bring claims about rulings in her state court family law case because this federal court cannot interfere with those rulings. According to Wisconsin electronic court records,

the state law case is ongoing and there is a pending appellate hearing.

Given Bausch's family law case is still in progress, I must abstain from deciding her claims as argued by Frost. *J.B. v. Woodard*, 977 F.3d 714, 722 (7th Cir. 2021) (citing to *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971); holding federal courts cannot adjudicate claims that take aim at a contested and ongoing family court custody dispute). If, on the other hand, Bausch argues that the garnishment ruling is final, her claims would be barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, which prohibits federal district courts from reviewing civil judgments entered by state courts. *Harold v. Steel*, 773 F.3d 884, 885 (7th Cir. 2014). Finally, under the domestic-relations exception to diversity jurisdiction, federal courts generally may not interfere with matters of divorce, custody, or child support. *Ankenbrandt v. Richards*, 504 U.S. 689, 703 (1992).

B. Defendant Wilson Defendant Wilson moves to dismiss the claims against her on various grounds. I will grant her motions for largely the same reasons that I am granting Frost's. In particular, a guardian ad litem is entitled to absolute immunity as long as the acts in issue "occurred within the course of their court appointed duties."

Cooney v. Rossiter, 583 F.3d 967, 970 (7th Cir.

2009). All of Bausch's allegations relate to Wilson's work as a court-appointed guardian ad litem. C. Dane County defendants

The county defendants are also entitled to dismissal under *Younger*, *Rooker-Feldman*, and the domestic-relations exception. Defendant Hanson is a court commissioner and thus he is also entitled to judicial immunity. *Dellenbach v. Letsinger*, 889 F.2d 755, 763 (7th Cir. 1989) (Court commissioners performing “functions integral to the judicial process” are also immune from liability). It’s not entirely clear what specific actions Bausch believes these defendants took to harm her. But the only reasonable inference from Bausch’s allegations is that they all acted within the scope of their duties with the child support agency during the family law case, which entitles them to absolute immunity. *Millspaugh v. Cnty. Dep’t of Pub. Welfare of Wabash Cnty.*, 937 F.2d 1172, 1176 (7th Cir. 1991) (“social workers and like public officials are entitled to absolute immunity in child custody cases on account of testimony and other steps taken to present the case for decision by the court”). D. Other counts Bausch also attempts to assert four counts under federal criminal statutes. Private parties have no authority to pursue claims under federal criminal statutes. *Norman v. Campbell*, 87 F. App’x 582, 584 (7th Cir. 2003). Bausch’s motions for injunctive relief. Dkts. 4 and 28, will be denied as moot, because I am dismissing all of the claims against each defendant.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Defendant Jacob Frost's motion to dismiss, Dkt. 15, is GRANTED.
 2. Defendant Emily Wilson's motion to dismiss, Dkt. 11, is GRANTED.
 3. The county defendants' motion to dismiss, Dkt. 7, is GRANTED.
 4. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief. Dkts. 4 and 28, are DENIED.
 5. This case is DISMISSED.
 6. The clerk of court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
- Entered June 26, 2023.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge

STILL REQUESTING FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Defendant and pro per, Kristin Bausch respectfully requests this Court to grant oral argument, in the interest of justice re Appellant's right to be heard.

Dated: 26th day of June, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

By: Kristin Bausch

Kristin Bausch, Pro Per
Plaintiff
1591 Partridge Hill Drive
Oregon, WI 53575

VERIFICATION

(STATE of Wisconsin)
 (COUNTY of Dane) ss.

I, Kristin Bausch (PRINT) being duly sworn, depose and says that I am named as the ACCUSED in the above-entitled proceeding and that the foregoing information is true to his own knowledge, except as to matters herein stated to be alleged on information and belief and as to those matters he believes it to be true.

Kristin Bausch
 (Signature), ACCUSED,
 In Propria Persona. All
 Rights Reserved
 pursuant to UCC-1-308.

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me

This 26TH day of JUNE, 2024

By [Signature]

Sworn to before me this 26 day of JUNE, 2024

[Signature] CARLEY DOTY-DUTCHER
 Notary Public

