

STATE OF WISCONSIN
IN SUPREME COURT

Case No. 91-0923

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

KATHLEEN BRAUN,
Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner.

On Petition For Review Of A Decision
Of The Court Of Appeals, District I,
Affirming The Order Entered In The
Circuit Court For Milwaukee County,
The Honorable Ted E. Wedemeyer, Jr.,
Circuit Judge, Presiding

REPLY BRIEF OF DEFENDANT-
APPELLANT-PETITIONER

STEPHEN M. GLYNN
ROBERT R. HENAK
SHELLOW, SHELLOW & GLYNN, S.C.
222 East Mason Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 271-8535

Attorneys for Defendant-
Appellant-Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I.	THE PROCEEDINGS OF MISSA ... FROM ... ORIGINAL POSITION ... BAR REFERENCE ...	
	Finally Admitted ...	
	Waiver ...	
	Cause Admitted ...	
II.	ARBITRARY EXAMINATION ... DEFINITION ... TRIAL	
III.	PROSECUTOR ... BRAUN OF ... FAIR TRIAL	
	Seymour ...	
	Bad Faith ...	
	Rebuttal ...	
IV.	MS. BRAIN ... CONFRONTATION	
	CONCLUSION	

Reed v. Ross, 468 U.S. 107 (1984)

Renkel v. State, 4 Alaska App. 100
(Alaska App. 1979)

Smith v. Murray, 403 U.S. 562 (1971)

Snyder v. Cornes, 603 F.2d 1000
(4th Cir. 1978)

State ex rel. State v. Mott, 603 F.2d 1000
Co. Cir. Ct. 1000
N.W.2d 832 (1987)

State v. Braund, 300 N.W.2d 569,
297 N.W.2d 1000 (1980)

State v. Burney, 300 N.W.2d 569,
(N.C. 1981)

State v. Dyess, 370 N.W.2d 22,
370 N.W.2d 22 (1985)

State v. Jenich, 288 N.W.2d 114,
288 N.W.2d 114 (1980)
on other grounds, 288 N.W.2d 114
(1980)

State v. Milash, 464 N.W.2d 21,
464 N.W.2d 21 (1981)
aff'd on other grounds, 464 N.W.2d 21,
72, 471 N.W.2d 1000 (1981)

State v. Nichols, 435 N.W.2d 298,
435 N.W.2d 298 (1989)

State v. Sarinski, 280 N.W.2d 7,
280 N.W.2d 7 (1980)

State v. Webb, 467 N.W.2d 108,
467 N.W.2d 108 (1981)

Tanksley v. United States, 58 F.2d 58,
58 F.2d 58 (9th Cir. 1942)

Teague v. Lane, 409 U.S. 443 (1972)

United States ex rel. Rundle, 419 F.2d 1000,
419 F.2d 1000 (1969)

United States v. 919 (3d Cir. 1974)

United States v. ...
(1985)

Wainwright v. ...
(1977)

Waller v. ...
(1984)

Wurtz v. Fleischman ...
293 N.W.2d 155

Zimmerman v. Wisconsin ...
Company, 38 W.S. ...
648 (1968)

Statutes

Wis. Stat. §80

Wis. Stat. §94

Wis. Stat. §97

Wis. Stat. §97

Wis. Stat. §97

Wis. Stat. §97

Other Authorities

3 Jafave & ...
§27.4(a) (1981)

A. J. W. 1000

N. J. M. 1000

1000

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Plaintiff

KATHLEEN BRAUN

Defendant

REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT

THE PROCEDURAL DISMISSAL OF MR. BRAUN'S ORIGINAL PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS DOES NOT BAR HIS CURRENT PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS

The state court's decision in *Ortega-Rodriguez* is flawed for several reasons. First, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun escaped prison is irrelevant. Second, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant. Third, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant. Finally, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant.

Finally, the court's decision is flawed for several reasons. First, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant. Second, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant. Third, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant. Finally, the court's reliance on the fact that Mr. Braun was a prisoner inmate is also irrelevant.

That, as a result, the court has the right to collateral review of the conviction filed following the defendant's appeal to dismiss a pending charge. It would imply the power to review the state claims of relief (to prevent a trial to deny post-arrest punishment (to prevent escape)). This is a violation of §974.06(4) which states that a knowing and intentional violation of 10-12

Ms. B. ... any collateral ... issues in the ... tunity to bear ... Court has no ... point. See *Ward v. ... N.W.2d 155* ... "[t]o relax the ... sense and de ... tion of ind ... State v. Milash ... (Ct. App. 1990) ... 471 N.W.2d 4

Cause And Prejudice ... cases interpret ... involving totally

urges this Court to require Ms. B... "procedural defects" by direct appeal... essary precedent... nor its underlying...

Under... procedural defects... poraneous... U.S. 12 (1972)... requiring all... appeal, Smith... Ross 468 U.S... as a matter of... Procedure §11... dure"). The... latter is fore... cedural rules... tional issue... tion under Wis... erly have been... supra; Loop...

App... plete subst... not every iss... appeal can... tion " Loop

limited to jurisdiction over the defendant's conduct. See, e.g., State v. Nix, 1988 WL 1000 (Ct. App. 1988), 301 (Ct. App. 1988). The defendant's right to a public trial is not taken does not make later trial error made later trial error.

These cases are not the federal courts' clearly established rights. Federal courts also account for its rules and procedures. An interest in courts were the state courts. Criminal Procedure has no relevance to own conviction. not require a trial has so held. amended the state

ARBITRARY EXCLUSION OF A
DENIED MS. 100 IN HER STATE

at 18:37

is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. The court also
reversal. See *State ex rel. ... Tax*
App. 1993) (affirming the court's
mandated reversal.

The state's argument that the court's decision is
less stringent than the court's decision in *State ex rel. ...*
sure is partially correct. The court has previously
ally hold that a state's decision to close a business is
tial closure does not constitute a "taking" without
riding." See *State ex rel. ...*
But see *State ex rel. ...*
141 Wis. 2d 1000 (1983) (holding that a state's
"compelling" interest in the state's cases.
may be required to pay compensation for the
closure damage. See *State ex rel. ...*
Douglas v. Warner (1983) (vacated)
mand. 739 F.2d 1000 (1984)
U.S. 1208 (1984) (1984)
(Alaska App. 1984)

The state's argument that the court's decision is
cause the expenditure of state funds is
rectly conceded. The court's decision
was not justified.

Lane, 489 U.S. 171, 180 (1989).

Even if the Government's theory is correct, the
very same implications would follow. It would be
derogatory to the Government's interest in
being harmless to the public. See
Dyess, 124 W.2d 100, 103 (1942).
beyond half a century ago.
state makes no sense.

**PROSECUTORIAL MISFEASANCE UNDER FEDERAL RULES
OF HER RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL AND A PUBLIC TRIAL**

The Court's opinion in *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 104 (1975),
from of Ms. Agurs' testimony. The Court
amply rebutted the Government's claim that
26-36. She was not a witness.

Seymour H. Hersh, Attorney General
at the time of the trial. The Court
agreement made by the Government.
that such was the case. The Court
Nonetheless, the Court
trary. (R47-15-36). The Court
quest for a fair trial. The Court
least a hearing on the issue.
the record. The Court
N.W.2d 773 (1988).

The Court's opinion in *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 104 (1975),
argued that they were not a witness.

son time, State v. ...
The prosecution ...
bility of such ...
evidence that ...
prison recommen- ...
cess in convicti- ...
viewed by the ...

Bad Faith

section that ...
its bad faith ...
Briet at 49 ...
States v. Youn- ...
rejected such ...
counsel could ...
at 12. The ...
misconduct dep- ...
in light of the ...
fense miscondi-

Rebuttal

that its blam- ...
of speculation ...

6 The prosecu- ...
reason he did ...
would contradict ...
arqued to the ...
was not trying ...
state's judicial ...
obligation to ...
Cf. Kellogg v. ...
N.W.2d 55-58

is demonstrated.

The debate there

ONCE UPON A

For this

Ms. Braun asked

remand this case

Date: 11/11/11

P.O. ADDRESS

222 East Mason Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
(414) 271-8500

1043c