

HO-CHUNK NATION COURT BULLETIN

April – December 2014

Issue



INDEX	Page
Recent HCN Trial Court Decisions	1
Recent HCN Supreme Court Decisions	7
HCN Court System Judiciary and Staff	8
HCN Judiciary Fee Schedule	8

Wa Ehi Hoci
W9598 Hwy 54 East
P.O. Box 70
Black River Falls, WI 54615
715.284.2722 (P)
800.434.4070 (Toll Free)
715.284.3136 (F)
<http://www.ho-chunknation.com/>

Catching up with the Ho-Chunk Nation Judiciary



The bulletin for the April - December 2014 is here. The Judiciary staff prepares these bulletins to keep everyone informed about the cases that are heard before the Ho-Chunk Nation Trial Court, and the Ho-Chunk Nation Supreme Court. The Court would like to update the community on what occurred in the Judiciary for the year 2014 in this case digest.



RECENT TRIAL COURT DECISIONS

Decisions are separated between Trial Court and Supreme Court decisions and categorized by subject matter. The following is a case digest that summarizes the number of cases for which the Courts issued orders. Cases are categorized and docketed as one of the following within the Trial Court: Child Support (CS or if filed prior to 1998, CV), Civil Garnishment (CG), Civil (CV), Criminal (CR), Child Trust Fund (CTF), Adult Incompetent Trust Fund (ITF), Citations (CIT), Adult Guardianship (GU), Domestic Violence (DV), Family (FM), or Juvenile (JV).

The following civil case summaries include decisions in which the Court discussed substantive legal issues, and excludes purely procedural and repetitive orders that retain little persuasive authority. The case summaries also exclude a majority of child support and civil garnishment decisions, but these orders appear within other compilations. Furthermore, the public may access all non-confidential orders through direct access to the case file. The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion, judgment or order of the Court, but has been prepared by the Staff Attorneys and Paralegal of the Trial Court for the purposes of facilitating research on various topics. Individuals should not rely upon the below summaries, but rather utilize the summaries as a starting point for further research.



CHILD SUPPORT CASES

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 167 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 39 *Orders (Motion to Modify)* included in the Motions are Motions to Amend, Reinstate, Cease or Suspend child support and/or arrears, adding or removing Equitable Adjustment, Consolidate Cases, Update, Release of Impounded funds and Granting of Attorney fees.

18 *Orders (Enforcing Child Support Against Per Capita)* the Court had to determine whether to enforce a standing foreign child support order against per capita.

2 *Orders (Enforcing Child Support against Wages)* the Court had to determine whether to enforce a standing foreign child support order against wages.

3 *Procedural Orders* which include Scheduling, Closing Cases, Granting Telephonic Appearances and Reissued Orders.

46 *Orders (Registration of a Foreign Judgment or Order for Child Support)* in which a newly filed foreign Order for support is registered with the Court for recognition and enforcement.

59 *Orders (Motion to Intervene)* The Court granted third party requests to intervene.



CITATION CASES

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 4 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 1 *Order (Default Judgment)* as the respondent failed to make an appearance or timely answer.

3 *Orders (Satisfaction of Judgment)* recognizing fulfillment of respondents' debt obligations.



CIVIL GARNISHMENT CASES

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 78 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 40 *Orders (Default Judgment)* the Court had to determine whether to grant full faith and credit and/or comity to a foreign judgment.

9 *Orders (Granting Motion to Modify)* where Petitioner indicated Respondent owed additional interest on recognized Judgment, Extension of Full Faith and Credit, Request to Court to Reinstate Withholding Due to Failure to Pay as Agreed Upon, Suspension of Activity, and Requesting Court to Suspend Case.

4 *Orders (Satisfaction of Judgment)* which upon the filing of a Satisfaction of Judgment, the Court recognized that the debt in these matters had been paid in full and informed the parties of its intent to close the file, absent a timely objection.

2 *Procedural Orders* included Erratum Orders, and Granting Telephonic Appearance.

6 *Orders for Dismissal* the Court indicated its intent to release the current garnishment in the case and dismissing without prejudice.



CIVIL CASES

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 53 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

15 *Orders (Petition Granted)* parties stipulated to payment and the Court granted the stipulation as proposed and the Court determining to maintain the status quo.

2 *Orders (Enforcing Foreign Judgment)* in which the Court grants enforcement of a foreign Order.

Black River Memorial Hospital v. Anna Reichenbach, Order (Amending Motion to Modify), CG 10-138 (HCN Jul. 21, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to decide on respondent's motion to split the post-judgment interest responsibility between the respondent and her husband. The Court found that, "when parties are married, a debt is considered a joint debt and a creditor can have the entire balance garnished from the wages of one of the parties. It is then the responsibility of that party to seek reimbursement of the debt or half of that debt from the other party."

Credit Acceptance Corporation v. Angela Cohoon, Order (Granting Post-Judgment Motion), CG 13-59 (HCN Tr. Ct., Sep. 10, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The respondent filed a post-judgment *Motion to Modify* to suspend wage garnishment as her income decreased to below the federal poverty line and she received FoodShare benefits. The Court found that receiving FoodShare benefits exempts people from having their wages garnished for debts owed pursuant to Wis. Stat. Section 812.44(5)(2). The Court therefore granted the motion.

Unifund CCR Partners Assignee of Palisade Acquisition XVI v. Robin L. Spatz, Order (Petition Granted), CG 14-81 (HCN Tr. Ct., Dec. 0, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A.)

Here, the Court had to decide whether to grant full faith and credit to a foreign judgment. Respondent disputed the allegation that she owed debt to Unifund and alleged that someone had stolen her identity. The Court found that Respondent had received notice of the proceedings in the foreign jurisdiction but had not contested them there. The Court therefore rejected respondent's allegations and granted the petitioner's *Petition to Register and Enforce a Foreign Judgment or Order*.



The Court issued 13 *Orders (Granting Motion)* to extend deadlines, expedite consideration, and staying proceedings.

7 *Orders for Dismissal* due to absence of valid subject matter jurisdiction over dispute, lack of standing, untimely filing of Complaint per statutory limitations, failure to comply with briefing deadlines, and dismissal due to the parties reaching an amicable resolution.

27 *Procedural Orders* included Granting Telephonic Appearances, Notices, Scheduling Orders, and Orders to Amend Pleadings.

5 *Orders (Denying Motion)* the Court denied motions to supplement.

1 *Order (Satisfaction of Judgment)* the Court recognized that the debt in this matter had been paid in full and informed the parties of its intent to close the file absent a timely objection.

Melodie Cleveland v. Mathew Mullen et. al, Order (Motion to Dismiss), CV 12-78 (HCN Tr. Ct., Jun. 20, 2014) (Lowe, J).

The Court had to determine whether the petitioner had standing to bring the case. The Court determined that the petitioner did not have standing because she did not articulate specific harm. The Court noted that monetary relief is not available against an official when the complaint is that he/she acted outside his/her official capacity. The Court therefore granted the motion to dismiss.

Patricia Boyles v. Wesley Boyles, Order (Partially Granting Motion), CV 09-70 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 19, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to decide whether to allow petitioner to recover an alleged debt from respondent. The Court found that the respondent did owe the petitioner for the purchase of a vehicle, but not for rent. The Court ordered withholding from the respondent's per capita as the debt was owed to an Elder. See CLAIMS AGAINST PER CAPITA ORDINANCE, 2 HCC § 8.5a(5).

Rita A. Gardner v. Tracy Littlejohn, Ronald Anwash, Jeremy P. Rockman, Nettie J. Kingsley, Order (Dismissal)

for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction), CV 10-47 (HCN Tr. Ct., Nov. 25, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to determine whether the court has subject matter jurisdiction over cases involving defamation. The Court found that, "a cause of action for defamation is not established by statute or by the Constitution of the Ho-Chunk Nation, and the previously established cause of action under Ho-Chunk custom and tradition was extinguished by the Supreme Court's decision." Therefore, the Court dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.



ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 8 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 8 *Procedural Orders* including Scheduling Orders, Notice of Oral Arguments, and Granting Motion for Extension.

Caroline Koukos v. Lucy Vargas and Marie Lewis, Order (Granting Motion to Dismiss), CV 14-05 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 19, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to determine whether to grant the Respondents' *Motion to Dismiss the Petition for Administrative Review*. The Court granted the motion since Petitioner filed the Petition thirty-six (36) days following the Grievance Review Board's decision. Most interestingly, the Court decided not to apply the doctrine of constructive knowledge against employees of the Nation, but the Court decided to uphold the Supreme Court precedent adhering to established statute of limitations.

Lisa Harrison v. Alec Thundercloud, Jess Thill, and Ho-Chunk Nation Department of Health, Order (Granting Motion to Dismiss), CV 13-21 (HCN Tr. Ct., Oct. 14, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Respondent filed a *Motion to Dismiss* since the Petitioner filed a *Petition for Administrative Review* thirty-one (31) days after the Grievance Review Board issued a final decision. The Court found that the Petitioner filed the petition one day late and thus granted the *Motion to Dismiss*.



CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND (CTF)

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 154 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 28 *Orders (Motion/Petition Granted)* for costs associated with orthodontic/dental care, for unmet costs and obligations, granting an Amended Petition, and granting Motion for Extension of Time to File Response.

5 *Orders (Requesting Accounting)* the Petitioner failed to submit the required accounting. Therefore, the Court requested that the Petitioner submit accounting.

56 *Orders (Accepting Accounting)* the Court previously released money from the minor child's CTF account. A Financial History was submitted for the minor child. Therefore, the court accepted the accounting.

7 *Procedural Orders* include Erratum Order, Scheduling, Granting Telephonic Appearance, Expiration of Consent Decree, Minute Orders and Recusal.

13 *Orders (Demanding Accounting)* the Petitioner failed to submit accounting to demonstrate that the funds were expended as required. Therefore, the Court demanded accounting.

6 *Orders (Dismissal)* Conditional Dismissal, and Dismissal without Prejudice due to petitioners' failures to appear at hearings, and a voluntary dismissal.

20 *Orders (Requesting Accounting)* the Petitioner failed to submit the required accounting. Therefore, the Court requested that the Petitioner submit accounting.

1 *Order (Requesting Additional Accounting)* the petitioner submitted documentation for a portion of the funds but failed to show how the remaining \$2,000 was used appropriately, thus the Court requested additional accounting.

7 *Orders (Show Cause)* the Petitioner failed to submit the required accounting despite a series of requests and demand to do so. Therefore, the Court scheduled a Show Cause Hearing to afford Petitioner an opportunity to explain why the Court should not find contempt.

8 *Orders (Contempt)* The Petitioner failed to submit accounting to demonstrate that the funds were expended as required. Reasonable opportunities to address the issue were afforded to the Petition. Following notice and a hearing, the Court held the Petitioner in contempt and imposed a reasonable remedial sanction.

1 *Order (Release of Contempt)* the Court accepted the offered untimely accounting and purged the contempt after release of a portion of the Contempt Fine.

2 *Orders (Motion/Petition Denied)* the Court denied Motions for Summary Judgment and Dismissal.

In the Interest of Minor Children: R.E.D., DOB 05/17/1999 and P.J.D., DOB 03/23/2002 v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, Order (Contempt), CV 12-61 (HCN Tr. Ct., Jun. 2, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court released funds to the petitioner to cover costs associated with orthodontics. The Court requested an accounting to ensure the funds were spent for orthodontics. The petitioner failed to provide an accounting, failed to appear at the Show Cause Hearing, and failed to contact the Court. Therefore, the Court found the petitioner in contempt and imposed a fine of \$10.00 for each day from the date of the order that the petitioner "remains in non-compliance with the standing judicial directives."

In the Interest of Adult CTF Beneficiary: Heather Youngthunder and Daniel Youngthunder v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, Order (Petition Granted in Part), CF 14-33 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 28, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

This case concerns a petition for the release of funds from an adult's Child Trust Fund for private school tuition and a computer. The petitioner was over 18 years of age but had not yet earned a diploma, thus the CTF was still intact. The Court granted a release of the funds for private school expenses as the petitioner demonstrated an exhaustion of public educational opportunities. The Court declined to grant a release for the purchase of a computer.

Incompetent's Trust Fund (ITF) **THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 13 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014**

The Court issued 8 *Orders (Motion Granted)* the Court needed to determine whether the legal guardian could access monies from the adult incompetent ITF account, the Court granted the request, *Petition Granted in Part, Reinstating Monthly Stipend & Guardian Fees, Outstanding Motion, and Suspending Release of ITF.*

1 Order (Requesting Accounting) the Petitioner failed to submit the required accounting. Therefore, the Court requested that the Petitioner submit accounting.

2 *Procedural Orders* which include *Scheduling Status Hearings.*

1 Order (Suspending Release) as the parties requested that the Court suspend the release of funds so that the ward remained eligible for medical benefits.

1 Order (Show Cause) the Petitioner failed to submit the required accounting despite a series of requests and demand to do so. Therefore, the Court scheduled a Show Cause Hearing to afford Petitioner an opportunity to explain why the Court should not hold the Petitioner in contempt.

In the Interest of Adult Incompetent: A.F., DOB 05/10/1979 v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, Order (Motion Granted in Part), CV 97-79 (HCN Tr. Ct., May 27, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to decide whether to release funds of an adult incompetent member's trust fund for a vehicle and installation of a wheelchair lift. The Court releases funds for buying vehicles in limited circumstances. The Court granted the motion to release funds for the purchase of a van because it satisfied the four-part test. However, the Court declined to release funds for installation of a wheelchair lift for insufficient details regarding the cost of installing the lift.

In the Interest of Adult Incompetent: L.L., DOB 12/22/1944 v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, Order (Accepting Accounting and Denying Motion), CV 10-19 (HCN Tr. Ct., Jun. 2, 2014) (Lowe, J).

The Court had to determine whether to allow petitioner to submit an annual accounting of quarterly released funds from the Incompetent Trust Fund instead of an accounting every quarter. The Court found that providing an accounting for each disbursement is not an undue burden and therefore denied petitioner's motion for an annual accounting.

In the Interest of Adult Incompetent: O.S.R., DOB 05/14/1968 v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, CV 97-117 Order (Removing Protective Payee; Joining CFS) (HCN Tr. Ct., Jul. 2, 2014) (Lowe, J).

The Court had to decide how to proceed in light of the appointed protective payee's failure to communicate. The Court removed her from the position. The Court permitted joinder of the Ho-Chunk Nation Child and Family Services as an interested party and scheduled a *Status Hearing* to determine what means would best meet the needs of the tribal member, and whether a

further appointment was necessary and appropriate in accordance with Ho-Chunk culture and traditions.

In the Interest of D.P.G., DOB 08/28/1982 v. Ho-Chunk Nation Office of Tribal Enrollment, Order (Motion Granted in Part), CV 05-15 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 13, 2014) (Lowe, J).

The Court had to decide whether to release funds for ward's living costs, a personal allowance, guardian/conservator fees, and attorney fees for defending the guardian/conservator. The Court granted a release of the funds for living costs, a personal allowance, and for guardian/conservator fees as those disbursements passed the four-part test. However, the Court denied the request to release funds to pay for the guardian's attorney fees since "the attorney benefited the guardian, but not the ward directly."

FAMILY

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 21 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 15 *Procedural Orders* including Granting Telephonic Appearance, Erratum, Minute Order, Appointment of Guardian ad Litem, Notices, and Scheduling Orders.

4 *Orders (Dismissal)* including Voluntary Dismissals and Conditional Dismissals.

1 *Order (Denying Motion)* in which the Court denied the party's motion for Expedited Consideration for failure to document the efforts made to resolve the issue with opposing party prior to filing the motion.

5 *Orders (Final Judgment of Divorce)*, the Court granted the parties' requested divorce.

In re the Marriage of: Eunice G. Mallory v. Ronald W. Mallory, Final Judgment of Divorce, FM 14-01 (HCN Tr. Ct., May 14, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

In re the Marriage of: Francis W. Steindorf v. Pamila J. Belgarde, Final Judgment of Divorce, FM 14-02 (HCN Tr. Ct., May 15, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

In re the Marriage of: Jeanine F. Heffner-McEuans v. Donald McEuans, Final Judgment of Divorce, FM 14-03 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 12, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

In re the Marriage of: Janet Muir v. Gary Muir, Final Judgment of Divorce, FM 14-04 (HCN Tr. Ct., Oct. 14, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

In re the Marriage of: Ken Littlegeorge v. Cheryl Littlegeorge, Final Judgment of Divorce, FM 14-08 (HCN Tr. Ct., Oct. 22, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

ADULT GUARDIANSHIP

THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED 11 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 10 *Procedural Orders*, including Appointment of Permanent Guardian, Accepting Stipulation, Scheduling Status Hearing, Minute Order, and Requesting Case File.

1 *Order (Granting Motion to Intervene)* in which the Court granted the Ho-Chunk Nation Child and Family Services' request to intervene.

In the Interest of: C.R., Order (Conditional Acceptance of Transfer), GU 13-05 (HCN Tr. Ct., Jun. 2, 2014) (WhiteEagle, A).

The Court had to decide whether to acceptance transfer of guardianship from another jurisdiction. The Court inferred authority to exercise jurisdiction over a transfer of guardianship from the Nation's ADULT GUARDIANSHIP ORDINANCE, 4 HCC § 14.14(d)(6). Therefore, the Court concluded that it had jurisdiction to accept a transfer of a foreign guardianship assuming the court finds transfer would be in the interests of the foreign ward.

JUVENILE CASES

ALL JUVENILE CASE DECISIONS SHALL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-EIGHT (238) ORDERS WERE ISSUED FROM APRIL 1, 2014 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2014.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

ALL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES SHALL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.



RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

THE SUPREME COURT ISSUED 10 ORDERS FROM APRIL 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

The Court issued 6 *Procedural Orders*, Accepting Appeal, Denying Appeal, Scheduling Order, and Rescheduling Oral Argument.

3 *Orders (Granting Motion)* for brief extension and motion for reconsideration.

1 *Order (Decision)* affirming the decision of the Trial Court.

Money Centers of America, Inc. and MCA of Wisconsin, Inc. v. Ho-Chunk Nation, Order (Granting Motion for Reconsideration)(Reissued), SU 13-07 (HCN S. Ct., Feb. 4, 2014).

The Court considered Appellee's *Motion for Reconsideration* filed on October 25, 2013 and issued an order on November 13, 2013. However, the earlier order was not filed promptly upon receipt due to the absence of a full-time Supreme Court Clerk. The Court, therefore, reissued this order granting Appellee's *Motion for Reconsideration*.

Steven W. Radtke v. Tricia Zunker, Order (Denying Appeal), SU 14-02 (HCN S. Ct., Mar. 20, 2014).

Appellant filed a timely *Petition for Interlocutory Appeal*, which the Court had to decide whether to grant. The Court found that appellant failed to "include a short statement of the reason or grounds for the appeal," and "articulate exactly how the lower court erred as a matter of law" as required by *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Appellate Procedure*, Rule 11(b). The Court thus decided to deny the appeal.

Daniel Topping v. Georgette Marvin and Ho-Chunk Nation Food and Beverage and Ho-Chunk Nation Grievance Review Board, Order (Granting Extension of Time to File Brief), SU 14-03 (HCN S. Ct., Apr. 11, 2014).

The Court had to decide whether to grant appellant's *Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief*. The Court decided to grant the motion and extend the deadline for the brief by thirty (30) days.

Mary Ellen Blackdeer Anwash v. Ho-Chunk Nation Enrollment Committee, Order (Accepting Appeal), SU 14-04 (HCN S. Ct., Jul. 14, 2014).

The Court had to decide whether to accept the interlocutory appeal. The appellant filed a timely *Notice of Appeal* and therefore the Court accepted the appeal.

Mary Ellen Blackdeer Anwash v. Ho-Chunk Nation Enrollment Committee, Order (Partially Granting Motion for Brief Extension), SU 14-04 (HCN S. Ct., Aug. 12, 2014).

Appellant came before the Court asking for a fifteen (15) day extension for the briefing schedule. The Court agreed to extend the briefing schedule by nine (9) days but kept the original date for oral arguments.

General Council Agency; Michael Salloway; Roberta Funmaker; Wilma Thompson; Muriel Whiteeagle-Lee; Rosetta Hunt; Francis Decorah; Roger Brinegar; Marvin Decorah, Sr.; Andi Jo Cloud; Matthew Mullen; and Mary Lopez v. Ho-Chunk Nation Legislature and Ho-Chunk Office of President, individually and in their official capacities, Order (Denying Appeal), SU 14-05 (HCN S. Ct., Oct. 28, 2014)

The Court had to decide whether to grant the interlocutory appeal. The Court found that the appellant failed to specify "why an immediate appeal may materially advance the termination of the litigation" as required by *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Appellate Procedure*, Rule 8. The Court therefore denied the appeal.

Wesley Boyles v. Patricia Boyles, Order (Accepting Appeal and Partially Granting Stay of Withholding of Per Capita Income), SU 14-07 (HCN S. Ct., Nov. 26, 2014).

The appellant filed a deficient *Notice of Appeal* as it did not conform to the requirements in Rule 11 of the *Ho-Chunk Rules of Appellate Procedure*. The Court, however, allowed appellant to cure the *Notice of Appeal* as he was appearing *pro se*. Appellant obtained an attorney and filed a correct *Notice* along with a request to stay the Trial Court's order garnishing his per capita income. The Court decided to accept the appeal and issue a partial stay of the Trial Court orders.

ALL JUVENILE CASE DECISIONS SHALL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. TWO (2) JUVENILE ORDERS WERE ISSUED BY THE SUPREME COURT FROM APRIL 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2014.



**HO-CHUNK NATION COURT SYSTEM
JUDICIARY AND STAFF**

Supreme Court – Mary Jo B. Hunter, Chief Justice
Todd R. Matha, Associate Justice
Tricia Zunker, Associate Justice

Traditional Court – Earl Blackdeer
Wayne Falcon
Dennis Funmaker
Cecil Garvin
Conroy Greendeer*
Roy Greengrass
Thomas Hopinkah
Richard Mann
Andrew Thundercloud
Preston L. Thompson, Jr.*
Morgan Whiteeagle
Clayton Winneshiek

*The Court notes the community lost these valuable members of the Traditional Court this year.

Trial Court – Jo Deen B. Lowe, Chief Judge
Amanda L. (Rockman) WhiteEagle, Associate Judge
Clerk of Court – Mary Thunder

The Ho-Chunk Nation Judiciary and its officers are active participants in the following organizations:

WISCONSIN TRIBAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION
(Eleven federally recognized tribes within the State of Wisconsin)

NATIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN COURT JUDGES ASSOCIATION
(Region 10 — Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin)

HCN Judiciary Fee Schedule

Filing Fees

<i>Complaint</i>	\$50.00
<i>Petition for Release of Per Capita Distribution (Children’s Trust Fund)</i>	\$50.00
<i>Motion to Appear Pro hac Vice</i>	\$35.00
Appellate Filing Fee.....	\$50.00
<i>Petition to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment/Order</i>	\$20.00
Marriage License Fee.....	\$50.00

Court Fees

Copying	\$0.10/page
Faxing	\$0.25/page (sending & receiving)
CD of Hearings	\$12.50/CD
Deposition Videotape	\$10.00/tape
Certified Copies.....	\$0.50/page
Equipment Rental	\$5.00/hour
Admission to Practice.....	\$50.00

Legal Citation Forms

The following are example citation forms by legal reference and citation description.

Ho-Chunk Nation Constitution

Constitution, Article Number, Section, Subsection.
HCN CONST., Art. II, Sec. (or §) 1(a).