_	Feb. 24. 2023 2:41PM 222222222222222222222222222222222222
PAGE 1/	1681 N Van Buren St. Milwaukee, WI 53202 Phone: 414-283-2679 Fax: 414-272-2414 milwaukee@dcopy.net
18 REC'D	Date: 24/23 Pages (Including Cover): 18
2/24/2023 2:43:18 PM [Central	FROM: leshih Griffer To: Attn: Brandon Hunzicker
3 2:43:1	Company: 4(4-239-246 Company: Wisc. Election Councisos
8 PM [C	Name: letter (Farmed regly)
_	
Standard Time] PRD 083276264	are today 3124/33 / am

VERIFIED SWORN APPEAL RESPONSE

(Exhibits attached/audio sent via attached e-mail)

I, FORMALLY file this verified appeal response to the respondents' answer to my verified appeal filed before the Wisconsin Election Commission regarding the filing officer's decision on January 9, 2023 to 'disregard' and deny my challenge to place Phil Chavez's name on the ballot for Municipal Judge, Branch 3 election. This response is made to the Wisconsin Election Commission through this submission of sworn written statements. To the extent as applicable by law, I, being the appellant, herein referenced as 'the appellant' requests that the administrative body take any and all judicial notice and judicial cognizance of all federal and state law as cited infra. My signature below verifies and affirms, under oath, UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY the following <u>facts</u> that are <u>true</u> and <u>correct</u> to the best of my personal knowledge, recollection and belief as it relates;

The respondents' failed to refute each verified statement of law and fact in the appellant's verified appeal filed before the Wisconsin Election Commission. Averments in a pleading to which a responsive pleading is required are deemed admitted when not denied in the responsive pleadings. See Wis. Stats. 802.02(4). See also Schlieper v DNR, 188, Wis. 2d 318, 525 N.W. 2d; 'arguments not refuted are to be deemed admitted.'

The appellant's formal verified appeal clearly states the 'issues' in the appeal and it is not as 'suggested' by counsel for the respondents'. The appellant formally refutes the respondents' answer in its entirety and objects to the unapproved minute documents that are not a correct or accurate depiction of events that have occurred. The appellant, again as in the previously included this week in the separate response regarding the subject matter, includes an actual true

unedited audio (via an attached e-mail) of the January 9, 2023, hearing of Chavez v Griffin, Griffin v Chavez, which is prima facie evidence that the respondents' have filed their answer in bad faith, with inaccuracies and false statements before the Wisconsin Election Commission.

On page1 of the respondents' legally insufficient purported verified response which is nothing short of speculation, conjecture and opinions of counsel that are not to be considered by law as law, counsel for the respondents' asks the WEC to dismiss the 'verified complaint' in its entirety. What is before the WEC is not a 'complaint', it is an 'appeal'. A 'verified' appeal. A 'complaint' is a written document regarding the quality of service, or lack thereof, which may or may not include the behavior of others as it relates.

An 'appeal' is an 'institute of legal proceedings' to review the lawfulness of actions taking and if such actions are consistent with clearly established law or are in violation of clearly established law and to impose corrective measures upon finding such violation; it provides for further appellate relief if need be and the respondents are to answer in accordance to law, and truthfully. The WEC is without jurisdiction, respectfully speaking to dismiss something that is not before it, the pleading filed with the WEC is not a 'complaint', as such the conclusion of the respondent is void ab intio. The appellant has met all conditions precedent in the verified appeal, and verified appeal's reply.

On the bottom of page 1 of the legally insufficient purported verified response which nothing short of speculation, conjecture and opinions of counsel that are not to be considered by law as law, counsel erroneously states the 'sole basis for the Challenge is that Chavez is not currently licensed to practice law in the State of Wisconsin as required by section 3-34-2-b, of the Milwaukee City Charter...' The conjecture and choice words of the counsel does not

supersede the facts. The appellant, provided the respondents with an affidavit on January 6, 2023 under penalty of perjury that pursuant to the 'purported' City of Milwaukee charter 3-34(b) stating in no uncertain terms 'A municipal court judge "shall" be an "attorney" "licensed" to practice law in Wisconsin', Phil Chavez failed to comply with these specific 'legal' requirements. The appellant met all conditions precedent relating to the appellant's burden as a challenger to prove that Phil Chavez "failed to comply with this specific legal requirements' pursuant to the 'purported' City of Milwaukee charter 3-34(b) and these requirements were evidenced by attached in the formal complaint filed with the filing officer. The filing officer had a mandatory duty to use the evidence as supplied yet went outside of the four corners of the complaint.

The appellant was in substantial compliance with the obligations that must be met by a challenger in a verified complaint pursuant to EL.2.07(3)(d). The appellant's affidavit is entitled to the presumption of validity. The filing officer failed to comply with her sworn duties relating to examining the appellant's verified sworn challenge as it relates. The filing officer refused to comply with her obligations relating to the appellant's verified challenge against Phil Chavez. The filing officer failed to use the evidence appellant supplied in the complaint and looked outside of the four corners of the complaint by using nonpromulgated memos that were outside the scope of evidence.

The audio provided is prima faice evidence that the respondents never accorded the appellant a full and fair hearing in accordance to due process and were more concerned with the heightened standards they unlawfully applied to the appellant nor did the respondents' consider the appellant's complaint, nor did Chavez's 'counsel' do anything but make bland jokes, never refuting the appellant's complaint or the allegations contained within. The appellant is entitled to

equal access to the equal opportunities and equal protections of the law. The issues before the WEC is not the 'sole' issued as described by the counsel for the respondents' but as stated in the formal appeal; the appellant formally appealed the filing officer's decision on January 9, 2023 to disregard and deny the appellant's challenge to place Phil Chavez name on the ballot for Municipal Judge, Branch 3 election. The decision and inaction is not in conformity with clearly established law as detailed in the formal verified appeal.

The interpretation of use of a nongovernmental union's website for 'license' verification', reference to a print out non certified paper for a 'synopsis' of SCR rules and a copy of a nonpromulgated 'synopsis' of a municipality's internal policy pursuant to an administrative charter is inconsistent with state and federal election laws including rule making authority in violation of the State Administrative Procedure Act.

Page 3, in the argument section of the legally insufficient purported verified response which nothing short of speculation, conjecture and opinions of counsel that are not to be considered by law as law, counsel statement that 'Griffin apparently concedes that candidates for Branch 3 of the City of Milwaukee Municipal Court must be in fact attorneys, is in itself reason to strike the affidavit in its entirety. A statement made on 'information or belief' is not sufficient to be a declaration contained in an affidavit, as it is contrary to the mandates of 'personal knowledge'.

The appellant makes no such concession, and is far from an accurate depiction of facts. The facts are clear, front and center. A person who meets the constitutional requirements for public office, cannot be denied the right to hold office IF elected. See Powell v McCormack, 395 US 486. This constitutional right cannot be circumvented by an unpromulgated municipality internal charter. The refusal to print the name of a candidate on the ballot after being duly

nominated by the will of the electors is an equal protection violation under the Fourteenth Amendment. See Williams v Rhodes, 393 US 23.

By failing to 'adhere' to the letter of the clearly established law, by way of failing to have a bond on file before entering his duties, Candidate Chavez is precisely what the appellant is accused of [purportedly] being IF elected; a 'defacto/de jure state judicial officer', usurping the office in which he currently purports to be in; being that he is operating pursuant to 'color of law' and not the establishment of law. The State of Wisconsin operates on a daily basis with 'elected' officers such as Candidate Phil Chavez, whom have usurped their position in office. The validity to challenging the legitimacy to a 'title' to office IF elected is not an election related ballot placement issue. Such challenge is by a 'non' election related clearly established legislative procedure. See Cole v The President and Trustees of the Village of Black River Falls, 57 Wis. 110, 14 N.W. 906. Candidate, Chavez, is and or should have been aware of such procedure given his illegitimacy to the title of office in which he currently usurps.

There is no express plain language in the statutes that has the 'legal liability' of a 'disqualification or ineligibility to hold office' as a consequence for [purported] non compliance, with the City of Milwaukee's nonpromulgated internal policy, charter 3-34(b), nor is there a 'specified date' of mandatory compliance with the 'unpromulgated internal charter policy. There is simply no evidence that a rule making consequence for noncompliance with the unpromulgated internal charter policy results in 'ineligibility' to hold public office.

In addition to the myriads of legal reasons the unpromulgated city internal policy is void ab intio is because the City of Milwaukee has no power nor rule making authority whatsoever to 'license' candidates for public office, no power nor rule making authority whatsoever to 'license' public officials, and absolutely no power nor rule making authority whatsoever to 'license' 'state

officers'. Period. No comma. The City of Milwaukee has no lawful, legal nor constitutional authority to mandate what it does not have lawful, legal nor constitutional authority to regulate. 'Licensing neither "power" nor rule making authority of such nature is no where within the City of Milwaukee's 'charter'. There is no express language found in federal law, or State of Wisconsin's state legislation law granted such to the City of Milwaukee.

The unpromulgated internal policy charter is invalid, void ab intio, in every sense of the word. The respondents' cannot authorize what federal law forbids. The respondents have engaged in unconstitutional activities as municipal employees and heavily burdened the rights of the appellant and the electors to associate for the advancement of political beliefs as well as the right of qualified voters to cast their votes effectively. State election laws must meet the Equal protection Clause of the United States Constitution.

'Municipal ordinances' are inferior in status and subordinate to state and federal law. In cases of direct conflict to state and federal law, it must yield, as both state and federal are laws are superior over such. Where state and/or federal law have enacted 'prohibitory' legislation in a particular subject a municipality has no authority to circumvent such restraints. Section 9, art. XIII of the Wisconsin constitution mandates all 'officers' via an 'election' shall_be elected' by the 'electors' of such 'cities', 'towns' and 'villages'.

It is an unconstitutional, unpromulgated unratified 'additional' ballot placement election related qualification in violation of Article 3, section I of the Wisconsin Constitution, in violation of the 5 election related laws in Article 3, section 2 of the Wisconsin Constitution, in violation of the right to suffrage, in violation to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Unites States Constitution, in violation of section 1, article 14 of the United States Constitution as it is an unreasonable abridgment and a unnecessary restraint on the privileges and immunities of the citizens,

unconstitutional and void, in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as it has a discriminatory and disparate effect on the minority vote and participation of an elective representative of their choosing, in violation of the Voting Rights Act, Section 2, violating the common rights in voting and creates an additional requirement unduly burdensome on a sector of people not found in the State of Wisconsin as a whole to be a requirement or prerequisite to voting of the citizens in a totality, in violation of the Clayton Act, Section 4 as it acts to monopolize a 'corner' in a public election.

Wisconsin Supreme Court Justice Hon. Shirley Abrahamson once noted in a judicial decision; "who are to be the electors..? Not the rich, more than the poor, not the 'learned' more than the 'unlearned'...the electors are to be the great "BODY" of the people....'...Body, as in the WHOLE...The right to elect is vested in the electors not the internal policy of an unpromulgated municipal charter. The City of Milwaukee has neither power nor rule making authority to 'appoint 'an'elected state officer.

The Wisconsin Constitution, section 1, article III prescribes the qualifications of electors. An unpromulgated municipality internal policy cannot impair the rights of those possessing those qualifications. The unpromulgated municipal internal charter creates an 'unlawful' "enterprise" contrary to federal law, specifically section 4 of the Clayton Act as the unpromulgated municipal internal policy charter clearly articulates that only by virtue of a 'license' (and according to the respondent the only way to obtaining such is as a fee paying member of a union referred to as 'the bar') can a candidate have standing to be hold in an 'elected public office'.

This is an unfounded 'revenue scheme'; under the "guise" of regulatory law, a 'non election related', 'non ballot placement election related law', designed with an intent to unlawfully disenfranchise and defraud 'the poor people from obtaining a 'piece of the pie', in PAGE 9/18 REC'D 2/24/2023 2:43:18 PM [Central Standard Time] PRD 083276264

violation of Lubin v Panish, 415 U.S. 709. An 'unequal, constitutionally impermissible weight' placed on candidates and voters alike in violation of Bullock v Carter, 405 US 134. The United States Supreme Court stated in Bullock; 'whenever a state or citizen regulates the right to become a candidate for public office, it also regulates the citizen's right to vote; the person or persons who's candidacy is affected maybe the candidate's choice for public official.' The Highest Court went on to announce that, 'the rights of voters and the rights to candidates do not lend themselves to neat separation; laws that affect candidates always have at least some theoretical, correlative affect on voters'. (Emphasis Added). The appellant, the public as well as the will and intent of the voters have a substantial interest and right to an 'unhampered', 'unconditioned' non privatized wide pool of candidates from which to select their representatives. 'Candidacy' and the rights to there under is protected by the First Amendment. The City of Milwaukee's unpromulgated internal administration policy discriminates against the residents of the city of Milwaukee, while candidates such as Beaver Dam's James H Brace or currently sitting state of Wisconsin municipal judges such as Kenneth Peters and Patrick Bulmn, (White males, whom are non lawyers) exercise the same political right that the respondents are attempting to deny the appellant, whom is just as if not more qualified than Brace, Peters and Bulmn; whom are similarly situated, and differ only in race and gender and status.

In a footnote counsel attempts to justify' Chavez's failure to meet his burden. Hearsay, speculation and conjecture cannot suffice in an affidavit, but must be based on personal knowledge of the facts. The fact is Chavez failed to meet fulfill his burden and the appellant fulfilled her, meeting all conditions precedent. The counsel blatantly lies that a 'copy' was provided to the appellant, and as heard in the audio, this is far from the truth. The respondents' makes excuses as to why copies were not provided to her, and directs the appellant to look in the

pamphlet, a pamphlet that was not provided to the appellant but was simply on the table. The actions of the respondents were in violation of due process, arbitrary and capacious. Lastly, counsel, erroneously states that the 'bond' for Chavez must be filed after election, yet the bond for Chavez's current position has yet to be 'located', as such by clearly established law, the office is 'deemed' vacate. Failure to have a bond on file before entering duties would make the office of Municipal judge ranch 3, 'vacant' and 'ineligible' to hold such office. The filing officer knowingly withheld information regarding Phil Chavez's ineligibility for Municipal Judge, Branch 3, and promulgated 'new law, 'new rule making' via memos and guides that were in violation of the rule making authority as detailed in Chapter 227 'Administrative Procedure Act'.

The respondents' again have failed to meet all conditions precedent. The filing officers dismissed the appellant's challenge based on a FALSE sworn document provided by Phil Chavez, alleging that the appellant's complaint was not sworn to by a notary. The appellant's complaint was sworn to by a notary authorized as a notary under the laws of the State of Wisconsin. Phil Chavez did not dispute, refute nor deny any allegation that I made in my sworn verified complaint. Arguments not refuted are deemed admitted. See Charolais Breeding Ranches, Ltd v FPC Sec. Corp, 90 Wis. 2d 97.

The appellant's provided evidence given and shown to the filing officer that 'attorney' and 'lawyer' did not mean the same thing. The appellant provided evidence given and shown to the filing officer that the State Bar of Wisconsin is not a government agency that has legal nor lawful authority to issues 'licenses' as 'defined' by clearly established law. A 'State of Wisconsin' membership bar card is not a license. The only government agency with legislative authority defined as a 'licensing bureau' is the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services, located in Madison, Wisconsin. Phil Chavez filed the same allegations against the

appellant and the filing officers lessened his burden of proof while heightening the appellant's. It is my belief that this constitutes prima facie evidence of discrimination. The appellant completed and complied with the United States Constitution, Wisconsin State Constitution, all State of Wisconsin law, rules and statues, as it relates to challenging requirements. The appellant has a constitutional right to conduct lawful business, in a lawful manner with all constitutional rights preserved. The appellant is entitled to equal rights, equal opportunity and equal protection of the laws under the United States.

Conclusion

The appellant has met all conditions precedent and is entitled to have her complaint challenging Phil Chavez's ineligibility accorded due diligence and used as prima facie evidence that <u>based</u> on the purported City of Milwaukee charter <u>and the clearly established definitions and prerequisites of 'attorney' and 'licensed'</u> Phil Chavez is ineligible for the office of Municipal Judge, Branch 3. The appellant is entitled to rely on the respondents' to comply with their duties and laws of the Wisconsin Constitution, State of Wisconsin and the United States Supreme Court as well as obligations under the Wisconsin Election laws.

Being first duly sworn under oath, my signature below verifies and affirms, under oath, UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY the above statements are <u>facts</u> that are <u>true</u> and <u>correct</u> to the best of my personal knowledge, recollection and belief.

leshon Enft WHAHSA

PUBLIC S

Appellant/Candidate

Notary

10

Exhibits Attached

- 1. Audio of the Jan. 9, 2023 (sent via e-mailed attachment)
- 2. Wisconsin Election Commission public notice for the January 9, 2023 with # 4 being a 'review of 'Chavez v Griffin' 'Griffin v Chavez'
- 3. 'Unapproved' minutes as written by the respondents' that are in direct contradiction to the audio, yet page 2 of the documents show that the hearing held was not in regards to 'Griffin v Chavez' but unconstitutionally and arbitrarily 'Chavez v Griffin'

4. Picture of one of many NON launger municipal Judges in the state of Mirrorian Peters about 5 he is NOT a launger, yet is on the bench as a State of Missionian Municipal Judge



Commissioners: Terrell Martin, Chair Patricia Ruiz-Cantu Douglas Haag

Executive Director: Claire Woodall-Vogg

Meeting of the City of Milwaukee Board of Election Commissioner's Monday, January 9, 2023, 5:00pm City Hall, 200 E Wells St, Room 501

AGENDA:

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Approval of polling place changes for Spring 2023
- 4. Review of Verified Complaints and Challenges to Nomination Papers; and action thereon
 - a. Jackson v. Hart
 - b. Reaves v. Milwaukee Election Commission

 - c. Chavez v. Griffin & Griffin v. Chavez - 1 Chaves of Griffin & Chaves d. Convene into Closed Session The Commission may adjourn into closed session under the provisions of Wisconsin Statutes Section 19.85(1)(a) for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or
 - quasi-judicial trial or hearing before the Commission. At the conclusion of the closed session, the Commission may reconvene in open session to take whatever actions it may deem necessary.
 - e. Reconvene into Open Session
- 5. Certification of Candidates for 2023 Spring Election and 2023 Special Election; and action thereon
 - a. School Board Director Districts 1, 2, 3, and 8
 - b. School Board Director At-Large
 - c. Municipal Judge Branch 2
 - d. Municipal Judge Branch 3
 - e. Alderperson District 1
 - f. Alderperson District 5
 - g. Alderperson District 9
- 6. Ballot Order Draw by the Executive Director
 - a. School Board Director District 3
 - b. School Board Director At-Large
 - c. Municipal Judge Branch 2
 - d. Municipal Judge Branch 3
 - e. Alderperson District 1, 5, 9
- 7. Adjournment

Reasonable accommodations, of an auxiliary aid or service required due to a disability, for a City of Milwaukee event will be provided upon request. Contact the City of Milwaukee ADA Coordinator, 414-286-3475 or adacoordinator@milwaukee.gov as soon as possible but no later than 72 hours before the scheduled event.



Commissioners: Terrell Martin, Chair Patricia Ruiz-Cantu Douglas Haag

Executive Director: Claire Woodall-Vogg

Meeting of the City of Milwaukee Board of Election Commissioners Monday, January 9, 2023, 5:00pm City Hall, 200 E Wells St, Room 501

Minutes:

- 1. The meeting was called to order by Chair Martin at 5:12pm.
- 2. Executive Director Woodall-Vogg took a roll call; Commissioner Martin, Ruz-Cantil, and Haag were all present.
- 3. Approval of polling place changes for Spring 2023
 - a. Commissioner Haag motioned to approve the polling place change of Ward 50 to Villard Library; seconded by Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu. Motion carried without a negative vote.
- 4. Review of Verified Complaints and Challenges to Nomination Papers
 - a. Jackson v. Hart
 - i. Executive Director presented a summary of the issues.
 - ii. Commissioner Martin provided Mr. Jackson and Ms. Hart the opportunity to make an oral statement.
 - iii. Commissioner Haag asked if any circulators of Ms. Hart's nomination papers were present. Melissa Zombor and Kristina Funa identified themselves as circulators for Ms. Hart's papers.
 - iv. Executive Director placed Ms. Zombor and Funa under oath. Commissioner Haar asked if any voters were confused as to Ms. Hart's committee and candidate names. Neither Zombor nor Funa found any voters were confused.
 - b. Reaves v. Milwaukee Election Commission
 - Executive Director Woodall-Vogg presented that she was changing her recommendation regarding ballot placement for Hendricks Reaves. A video on Getting on the Ballot on the Wisconsin Election Commission's (WEC) website refers to counting "supplemental signatures," beyond the maximum threshold established by state statute. While Woodall-Vogg and Assistant City Attorney Block both think that state statute and administrative rules are very clear regarding the maximum number of signatures, the Commission has a long history of following the standards set by WEC.
 - ii. Commissioner Martin provided Hendricks-Reaves with the opportunity to make an oral statement.
 - c. Chavez v. Griffin & Griffin v. Chavez

NOG SVEY SVEY LOW SVE

MILWAUKEE

Ex3

i. Executive Director Woodall-Vogg presented a summary of Mr. Chavez's complaint and Ms. Griffin's complaint. She specifically reviewed the City of Milwaukee Charter that requires Municipal Judges be licensed attorneys in Wisconsin, along with State Statute 8.30 that outlines reasons someone may be ineligible for ballot placement.

ii. Commissioner Martin provided the representative of Mr. Chavez, MichaelMaistelman, and Ms. Griffin the opportunity to make an oral statement.

iii. Executive Director placed Ms. Griffin under oath for the Commissioners to ask additional questions.

iv. Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu ask Ms. Griffin to explain her qualifications to occupy this office in light of the evidence presented that she is not a license attorney.

v. Ms. Griffin cited her written response to the challenge, including Keller v. State Bar of California and the separation of powers clause regarding the City's inability to establish such a rule. She also asserted that she is a paralegal, has assisted people in court, and that the court grants waivers for attorneys.

d. Commissioner Haag motioned that the Board convene into closed session, per Wis. Statute 19.85(1)(a) for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of a quasi-judicial hearing before the Commission. Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu seconded. Motion carried with a roll call vote all in favor.

e. Commissioner Martin called the meeting back to order at 6:07pm with all commissioners present.

f. Commissioner Rub Cantu moved to dismissed the challenge of Jackson v. Hart; Commissioner Haag seconded. Motion carried without a negative vote.

g. Commissioner Haag moved to grant Ms. Hendricks Reaves request and place her on the ballot for School Board District 1 based upon her supplemental signatures; Commission Ruiz-Cantu seconded. Motion carried without a negative vote.

h. Commussioner Martin turned the meeting over to Commissioner Haag to act as chair.

i. Commissioner Martin motioned to remove Ms. Griffin from the ballot for Municipal Judge Branch 3 based upon the evidence that Ms. Griffin would not be able to meet the qualifications to hold office by May 1, 2023 if elected; Commissioner Haag seconded. Motion carried without a negative vote.

Commissioner Martin motioned to dismiss the challenge of Griffin v. Chavez;
 Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu seconded. Motion carried without a negative vote.

k. Commissioner Martin resumed leading the meeting as the Board's chair.

Certification of Candidates for 2023 Spring Election and 2023 Special Election

75 11

2023 Spring Election and 2023 Special I

No head of the loss of the los

13

- a. Commissioner Haag motioned to certify the candidates as presented by Executive Director Woodall-Vogg; Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu seconded. Motion carried without a negative vote.
- 6. Executive Director Woodall-Vogg commenced the ballot order draw for all contests with multiple candidates:
 - a. School Board Director District 3
 - b. School Board Director At-Large
 - c. Municipal Judge Branch 2
 - d. Municipal Judge Branch 3
 - e. Alderperson District 1, 5, 9
- 7. Commissioner Haag motioned to adjourn at 6:25pm; Commissioner Ruiz-Cantu seconded. The motion carried without a negative vote and the meeting was adjourned at 6:25pm.



https://www.wiscnews.com/community/bdc/beaver-dam-municipal-court-judge-to-retire-peters-recallsmemorable-career/article_58437f5f-ea8b-5bf0-a3d0-cd39ec523efc.html

ALERT

TOP STORY

Beaver Dam Municipal Court judge to retire: Peters recalls memorable career

kthomas-at-capitalnewspapers-com

Dec 9, 2022



Beaver Dam Municipal Court Judge Ken Peters will retire April 30, 2023. He is shown in the courtroom with a special gavel for large cases, for which he has overseen many. KEN THOMAS, DAILY CITIZEN

While working several cases as a detective he had a heart attack. He then landed in the district attorney's office investigating major crimes.

"In 1999 I was honored as Law Enforcement Officer of the Year for Dodge County," Peters said. That was really nice. All 23 chiefs in the county voted unanimously for me, which was really terrific."

He retired in 2001 and immediately joined the staff at the coroner's office.

"With all my experience I at least knew what I was doing, which helped a lot," he said.

He then served on the Beaver Dam Teen Court. He eventually took over as Beaver Dam Municipal Court Judge, following Judge Judy Johnsen, who retired from that post.

Each position held its challenges, such as processing human remains for evidence and facing challenging attorneys in court.

"I am not a lawyer," he said, clarifying some of his background. "You face a lot of attorneys because you're having an impact on people's lives, but I have a lot of help."

Municipal Court Clerk Dawn Kuczniewicz is particularly helpful and has held her position for the past 22 years.

"She's invaluable," he said.

He continued, "It has been a very rewarding career for me," he said with his constant smile and good humor. "I've learned a lot and I think I have the right personality for this work - especially in the courts. I'm not there to make zillions of dollars. I just want people to admit that they 'boo-booed', that they admit it. That they learned the law and they get some kind of a fine and they're on their way."

DOWNTOWN BEAVER DAM HOLIDAY PARADE

Beaver Dam held its annual Downtown Beaver Dam Holiday Parade on Saturday evening. A large crowd braved the cold to be part of the excitement.