

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the  
Eastern District of Wisconsin

RECEIVED

SEP 21 2021

Kimberly howell

Plaintiff

v.

Manitowoc city

Defendant

Civil Action No.

CITY ATTORNEY

## NOTICE OF A LAWSUIT AND REQUEST TO WAIVE SERVICE OF A SUMMONS

To: Manitowoc city

(Name of the defendant or - if the defendant is a corporation, partnership, or association - an officer or agent authorized to receive service)

## Why are you getting this?

A lawsuit has been filed against you, or the entity you represent, in this court under the number shown above. A copy of the complaint is attached.

This is not a summons, or an official notice from the court. It is a request that, to avoid expenses, you waive formal service of a summons by signing and returning the enclosed waiver. To avoid these expenses, you must return the signed waiver within \_\_\_\_ days (give at least 30 days, or at least 60 days if the defendant is outside any judicial district of the United States) from the date shown below, which is the date this notice was sent. Two copies of the waiver form are enclosed, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope or other prepaid means for returning one copy. You may keep the other copy.

## What happens next?

If you return the signed waiver, I will file it with the court. The action will then proceed as if you had been served on the date the waiver is filed, but no summons will be served on you and you will have 60 days from the date this notice is sent (see the date below) to answer the complaint (or 90 days if this notice is sent to you outside any judicial district of the United States).

If you do not return the signed waiver within the time indicated, I will arrange to have the summons and complaint served on you. And I will ask the court to require you, or the entity you represent, to pay the expenses of making service.

Please read the enclosed statement about the duty to avoid unnecessary expenses.

I certify that this request is being sent to you on the date below.

Date: 09/21/2021

Manitowoc city

Signature of the attorney or unrepresented party

Printed name

Address

E-mail address

Telephone number

Print

Save As...

Reset

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the  
Eastern District of Wisconsin

Kimberly howell

Plaintiff

v.

Manitowoc city

Defendant

Civil Action No.

## WAIVER OF THE SERVICE OF SUMMONS

To: Manitowoc city  
(Name of the plaintiff's attorney or unrepresented plaintiff)

I have received your request to waive service of a summons in this action along with a copy of the complaint, two copies of this waiver form, and a prepaid means of returning one signed copy of the form to you.

I, or the entity I represent, agree to save the expense of serving a summons and complaint in this case.

I understand that I, or the entity I represent, will keep all defenses or objections to the lawsuit, the court's jurisdiction, and the venue of the action, but that I waive any objections to the absence of a summons or of service.

I also understand that I, or the entity I represent, must file and serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 within 60 days from \_\_\_\_\_, the date when this request was sent (or 90 days if it was sent outside the United States). If I fail to do so, a default judgment will be entered against me or the entity I represent.

Date: 09/21/2021Signature of the attorney or unrepresented partyManitowoc city

Printed name of party waiving service of summons

Printed nameAddressE-mail addressTelephone number

## Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Expenses of Serving a Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain defendants to cooperate in saving unnecessary expenses of serving a summons and complaint. A defendant who is located in the United States and who fails to return a signed waiver of service requested by a plaintiff located in the United States will be required to pay the expenses of service, unless the defendant shows good cause for the failure.

"Good cause" does not include a belief that the lawsuit is groundless, or that it has been brought in an improper venue, or that the court has no jurisdiction over this matter or over the defendant or the defendant's property.

If the waiver is signed and returned, you can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or of service.

If you waive service, then you must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 on the plaintiff and file a copy with the court. By signing and returning the waiver form, you are allowed more time to respond than if a summons had been served.

Print

Save As...

Reset

Kimberly Howell  
2000 Johnston Dr. #25  
Manitowoc, WI 54220

RECEIVED

SEP 21 2021

CITY CLERKS OFFICE

City of Manitowoc  
900 Quay Street  
Manitowoc, WI 54220





UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
for the

**Kimberly Howell**

**Plaintiff(s)**

**V.**

Defendant(s)

**Civil Action No. 21CV1069**

## SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

**To: (Defendant's name and address)** Manitowoc County,Manitowoc cty Human Services  
Peter Conrad, Stephanie Willis Judge Mark Rohrer  
1010 s. 8thst  
Manitowoc wi 54220

**A lawsuit has been filed against you.**

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Kimberly Howell  
2000 Johnston dr #25  
Manitowoc wi 54220

**If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.**

**CLERK OF COURT**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk*

Civil Action No. 21CV1069

### PROOF OF SERVICE

*(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
 on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

☐ I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
 designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_; or

☐ Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

To Whom this may concern.

21CV1069

SEPT 21,202Q

**This is a TPR CASE WHERE TIME IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE AS THE COUNTY HAS DOCUMENTED THAT ADOPTION WILL BE THE CONCURRENT GOAL AND IS NOT WORKING TOWARDS REUNIFICATION. REFUSES TO PLACE WITH FAMILY WHO HAVE A SPOTLESS RECORD.**

**KIMBERLY HOWELL**

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of Wisconsin

Division

SEP 14 2021

Kimberly HOWELL

Case No.

21 CV 1069

(to be filled in by the Clerk's Office)

## Plaintiff(s)

(Write the full name of each plaintiff who is filing this complaint. If the names of all the plaintiffs cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names.)

-v-

MANITOWOC CITY (see attached)

## Defendant(s)

(Write the full name of each defendant who is being sued. If the names of all the defendants cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names.)

Jury Trial: (check one) ☒ Yes ☐ No

## COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

## I. The Parties to This Complaint

## A. The Plaintiff(s)

Provide the information below for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

Name	Kimberly HOWELL
Street Address	2000 JOHNSTON DR #25
City and County	Manitowoc
State and Zip Code	WI 54220
Telephone Number	920-629-7487
E-mail Address	kahowell29@gmail.com

## B. The Defendant(s)

Provide the information below for each defendant named in the complaint, whether the defendant is an individual, a government agency, an organization, or a corporation. For an individual defendant, include the person's job or title (if known). Attach additional pages if needed.



Defendant No. 1

Name	Stephanie will
Job or Title (if known)	Cps worker
Street Address	926 s. 8th
City and County	Manitowoc, manitowoc
State and Zip Code	WI 54220
Telephone Number	920-683-4230
E-mail Address (if known)	StephanieWillis@co.manitowoc.wi.us

Defendant No. 2

Name	Det DAVE MCCue
Job or Title (if known)	Detective
Street Address	900 QUAYI
City and County	Manitowoc, MANITOWOC
State and Zip Code	WI 54220
Telephone Number	
E-mail Address (if known)	

Defendant No. 3

Name	Brianna Zipperer
Job or Title (if known)	Social worker
Street Address	
City and County	Greenbay
State and Zip Code	WI
Telephone Number	
E-mail Address (if known)	

Defendant No. 4

Name	Peter CONRAD
Job or Title (if known)	Corprate counsel
Street Address	1010s.8th st
City and County	Manitowoc Manitowoc
State and Zip Code	WI 55220
Telephone Number	9206834030
E-mail Address (if known)	Peterconrad@co.manitowoc.wi.us

**II. Basis for Jurisdiction**

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction (limited power). Generally, only two types of cases can be heard in federal court: cases involving a federal question and cases involving diversity of citizenship of the parties. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a case arising under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a case in which a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State or nation and the amount at stake is more than \$75,000 is a diversity of citizenship case. In a diversity of citizenship case, no defendant may be a citizen of the same State as any plaintiff.

What is the basis for federal court jurisdiction? *(check all that apply)*



Federal question



Diversity of citizenship

Fill out the paragraphs in this section that apply to this case.

**A. If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is a Federal Question**

List the specific federal statutes, federal treaties, and/or provisions of the United States Constitution that are at issue in this case.

4th, 5th and 14th

Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law"

**B. If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is Diversity of Citizenship****1. The Plaintiff(s)****a. If the plaintiff is an individual**

The plaintiff, *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_, is a citizen of the  
State of *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_.

**b. If the plaintiff is a corporation**

The plaintiff, *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_, is incorporated  
under the laws of the State of *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_,  
and has its principal place of business in the State of *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_.

*(If more than one plaintiff is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the same information for each additional plaintiff.)*

**2. The Defendant(s)****a. If the defendant is an individual**

The defendant, *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_, is a citizen of  
the State of *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_. Or is a citizen of  
*(foreign nation)* \_\_\_\_\_.

b. If the defendant is a corporation

The defendant, (name) \_\_\_\_\_, is incorporated under  
the laws of the State of (name) \_\_\_\_\_, and has its  
principal place of business in the State of (name) \_\_\_\_\_.  
Or is incorporated under the laws of (foreign nation) \_\_\_\_\_,  
and has its principal place of business in (name) \_\_\_\_\_.

*(If more than one defendant is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the same information for each additional defendant.)*

3. The Amount in Controversy

The amount in controversy—the amount the plaintiff claims the defendant owes or the amount at stake—is more than \$75,000, not counting interest and costs of court, because *(explain)*:

3million or what the jury decides almost 3 yrs deprivation of any communication. A 3 yr old who had all her firsts with out us we can never get back

---

**III. Statement of Claim**

Write a short and plain statement of the claim. Do not make legal arguments. State as briefly as possible the facts showing that each plaintiff is entitled to the damages or other relief sought. State how each defendant was involved and what each defendant did that caused the plaintiff harm or violated the plaintiff's rights, including the dates and places of that involvement or conduct. If more than one claim is asserted, number each claim and write a short and plain statement of each claim in a separate paragraph. Attach additional pages if needed.

Violation of 4th 5th and 14th amendment  
Under of color of law  
Illegal search and seizure of a private school  
Illegal interviews at school with disabled students  
Lied remove kids lied to keep kids

---

**IV. Relief**

State briefly and precisely what damages or other relief the plaintiff asks the court to order. Do not make legal arguments. Include any basis for claiming that the wrongs alleged are continuing at the present time. Include the amounts of any actual damages claimed for the acts alleged and the basis for these amounts. Include any punitive or exemplary damages claimed, the amounts, and the reasons you claim you are entitled to actual or punitive money damages.

Return of all the children  
Legal fees  
3million for punitive damages or whatever the jury sees fit.

**V. Certification and Closing**

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

**A. For Parties Without an Attorney**

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case-related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Date of signing: 09/12/2021

Signature of Plaintiff

Kimberly Howell

Printed Name of Plaintiff

Kimberly Howell

**B. For Attorneys**

Date of signing: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Attorney

Printed Name of Attorney

Bar Number

Name of Law Firm

Street Address

State and Zip Code

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

**2. CASE MANAGEMENT FLOWCHART foster care With**  
**in 24 hours, we had ours in 72 hrs I couldn't**  
**participate. I was in jail on lies and trumped up charges**  
**made up.**

**Petition Filed Within 21 days after the shelter**  
**hearing NEVER HAD**

**or within 7 days after any party files a demand for**  
**the early filing of a dependency petition, whichever**  
**comes first, NEVER HAD**

**Arraignment and Shelter Review Within 28 days**  
**from shelter hearing**

**or within 7 Adjudication Within 30 days after**  
**arraignment, (never ?had)**

**Disposition Within 15 days after arraignment hearing**  
**(never had)**

**30 days from last day of adjudicatory hearing Case**  
**Plan submitted 60 days Review Within 90 days (never**  
**had)**



## Case law

Illegal search and seizure.

Supreme Court to Hear Case on Seizure, Questioning of Children in Schools

Diane L. Redleaf

Camreta/Alford v. Greene, USSC No. 09-1454/1478,

### **Coerced signatures or agreements unconstitutional law**

**The judge has ruled in the case of Maureen 'Nikkie' Holliday versus the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services social workers who imposed a restrictive "Prevention Plan" the single mom was coerced into signing. It required her to have strictly supervised contact with her four-year-old daughter. The threatened penalty was foster care for her child.**

**(Applies to Corporate counsel Peter Conrad coercing me into agreeing not to go to trial and agree to a chips., I felt I had to sign it if I wanted to see my grandchildren or keep guardianship up to this the last 6 mo Dec of 2019 I'd had no contact.)which he lied I never got visits and the judge took my guardianship in my criminal case to make it appear they honored that agreement in the chips. Rohrer was judge on both cases and a conflict of interest and he refused to step down.**

### **SIXTH CIRCUIT GRANTS IMMUNITY FOR SOCIAL WORKER IN ABUSE INVESTIGATION**

On December 2, 2015, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals decided Barber v. Miller [i], immunity was granted in this case

It was granted in this case because the worker obtained a court order before removing the child from school. I argue immunity should not be granted in my case because they removed my grandchildren from school without obtaining a court order or warrant essentially kidnapping them, essentially denying them their liberty. The fact they were in school they can't use the argument there was risk of imminent harm unless they are suggesting they were in danger at school.

### **Due Process Clause**

In the U.S. Constitution, the phrase "due process" appears twice: in the Fifth Amendment and in the Fourteenth Amendment. Both Amendments guarantee due process when someone is denied "life, liberty, or property."

Historically, due process ordinarily entailed a jury trial. The jury determined the facts and the judge enforced the law. In past two centuries, however, states have developed a variety of institutions and procedures for adjudicating disputes. Making room for these innovations, the Court has determined that due process requires, at a minimum: (1) notice; (2) an opportunity to be heard; and (3) an impartial tribunal. *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank* (1950).

The Court has also deemed the due process guarantees of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to protect certain substantive rights that are not listed (or "enumerated") in the Constitution. The idea is that certain liberties are so important that they cannot be infringed without a compelling reason no matter how much process is given.

<https://www.oyez.org/cases/1789-1850/32us243>

[http://www.oyez.org/cases/1970-1979/1975/1975\\_74\\_204](http://www.oyez.org/cases/1970-1979/1975/1975_74_204)

1.)DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW

SUMMARY:Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim.

The offense is punishable by a range of imprisonment up to a life term, or the death penalty, depending upon the circumstances of the crime, and the resulting injury, if any.

TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United

States, ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

applies to state social workers has been dealt another blow in the U.S. District Court in Covington by Senior Judge William Bertlesman.

The judge has ruled in the case of Maureen 'Nikkie' Holliday versus the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services social workers who imposed a restrictive "Prevention Plan" the single mom was coerced into signing. It required her to have strictly supervised contact with her four-year-old daughter. The threatened penalty was foster care for her child.

Bertleman has ruled that Holliday's due process claims and her emotional distress claims are legitimate and that the social workers are not entitled to qualified immunity.

Nikkie Holliday and her daughter (Photo provided)

Holliday is a single mother and an army combat veteran. She worked two jobs and was going to school at the time of her unfortunate experience with CHFS, so her daughter was enrolled in a Florence daycare center. She has since graduated from the University of Cincinnati (in social work) and is working with a homeless veterans' group.

Her daughter had a bruise on her buttocks that she said she got when another child at the daycare bit her. When the daycare was alerted to the bite, they involved the Cabinet and social worker Alecia Leigh took charge and threatened to take the daughter into custody on the spot if Holliday did not sign the Prevention Plan agreement. She signed under duress.

Austin v. Borel, [9] the court ruled that child protection workers were not entitled to absolute immunity when they filed an "allegedly false verified complaint seeking the removal of two children" from the family home (at 1363).

15-55563 Preslie Hardwick v. Marcia Vreeken- perjury to take someone's children. Mind boggling



## **Defendants**

- 1.) Manitowoc county**
- 2.) Stephanie Willis**
- 3.) Peter Conrad**
- 4.) Judge mark rohrer**
- 5.) City**
- 6.) Manitowoc police department**
- 7.) Detective Dave McCue**

**Manitowoc county  
1010 s.8th. (Peter Conrad, Mark Rohrer)  
Manitowoc wi  
54220**

**Manitowoc County Human services  
926 s.8th  
Manitowoc Wi 54220  
Stephanie Willis Brianna zipperer**

**Manitowoc city  
900 Quay st  
Manitowoc wi  
54220**

**Dave McCue  
900 quay st  
Manitowoc wi 54220**

---

Kimberly Howell

2000 JOHNSTON DR #25

MANITOWOC WI 54220

920-629-7487

[kahowell129@gmail.com](mailto:kahowell129@gmail.com)

Right to be heard.

Cover sheet

Date SEP 08,2021

Case 19JC133

48.38 (5mc) right to be heard.

Pg 1

Page

**P Case # 19JC133**

**To Whom it may concern**

- **The reason I'm in federal court is because I need a federal question answered as well as constitutional law violations. First children receiving special ed services should not be subject to interrogations regardless whether its criminal, civil or Family cases which more times than not result in false information being extracted, because in my case my disabled children don't have the confidence or assertiveness to correct a person of authority and stranger whom they have never met whether disabled or not.. Grandchildren's my grandchildren can only be construed as disturbing.. MY granddaughter, age**

---

7 changed her story no less than 1,2 3 times. Is it or should it be unconstitutional for cps to go to a school, pull a disabled child out of a special ed class room where they have people trained to be able to understand a disabled person who takes where the disabled children have speech therapy, because they struggle to understand or comprehend what a person may be asking.. and begin interrogating them in an isolation room with only a detective and a cps worker whom have never met nor have training in dealing with special needs of Special needs people whether adult or child, my grandson JR goes to talk therapy and they usually play a game where the therapist will cheat or do something wrong. Her purpose for that is to build his confidence to correct someone. He won't correct someone if they are an adult he figures they know. Let alone my special needs grandchildren.

I raise this question because my disabled grandchild was interviewed by cps one time with his teacher and a good thing he was because she had to correct the worker on

information the cps worker was attempting to manipulate my disabled grandson til his teacher stepped in and stopped her. Then on this occasion that brings us here, which I feel was abuse in itself. These children with disabilities get upset, nervous and don't like their routine changing on a whim, my grandchildren have a routine where they eat the same time every day go to bed the same time everyday. When their routine is changed it causes them immense anxiety. Their interviews can not be trusted. These interviews even with non disabled kids should be thrown out when they ask a 7 yr old disabled child what her sister does all day while she's in school. How would she know if she's in school. A disabled child doesn't have the confidence to say how would I know if I'm in school. They assume they should know if an adult is asking.'

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS QUALIFIED IMMUNITY AND WHY THEY SHOULDN'T BE ALLOWED TO CLAIM IT. AT THE END OF MY COMPLAINT THERE WILL BE A COUPLE OF PAGES OF CASE LAW I CITED WHICH I FEEL QUALIFIES MY SITUATION FOR THE SAME CASE LAW.



I believe the defendants QUALIFIED IMMUNITY DOES NOT  
APPLY IN THIS CASE. IMMUNITY ONLY PROTECTS GOVERNMENT  
EMPLOYS IF THEY WERE DOING THEIR JOB AND INNOCENTLY  
BELIEVED WHAT THEY WERE DOING WAS LEGAL. TELLING THE  
TRUTH AND NOT LYING IN COURT UNDER OATH I BELIEVE IS VERY  
CLEARLY ESTABLISHED SINCE THE BEGINNING OF COURTROOMS  
WHICH IS WHY WE GET SWORN IN..DENYING ME DUE PROCESS ALSO  
I believe is clearly established constitutional law,  
because

Demaree v Pederson, No 14-16207 (9th Cir., January 23,  
2018) (Per Curiam) NO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR SOCIAL  
WORKERS WHO REMOVE CHILDREN FROM HOME WITHOUT WARRANT  
WHERE THERE IS NO IMMINENT HARM TO CHILDREN AT THE TIME  
TO JUSTIFY THE REMOVAL illegal search and SEIZURE

42 U.S. Code § 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of  
rights, illegal removal and lied to keep kids in care. ^  
MY CASE OR THIS CASE THEY WERE ^WORKING UNDER COLOR OF  
LAW WHILE PRETENDING TO DO THEIR JOB THEY WERE ACTUALLY  
VIOLATING MY RIGHTS LYING AND BREAKING THE LAW.

---

FIRST 2 DEFENDANTS BRIANNA ZIPPERER AND DETECTIVE DAVE

MCCUE WALKED INTO A SCHOOL AND AT SEPERATE TIMES PULLED MY 2 DISABLED GRANDCHILDREN OUT OF CLASS TO INTERROGATE THEM WITH OUT SUPPORT STAFF OR FAMily OR FAMILIAR FACES TO PUT THEM AT EASE. INSTEAD TOOK ADVANTAGE OF THE FACT THEY WERE EASILY MANIPULATED.

NOW MY FIRST TWO DEFENDANTS BRIANNA ZIPPERER , AND

DETECTIVE DAVE McCUE violated my 4th amendment right by BRIANNA ZIPPERER AND DETECTIVE DAVE McCUE COMING TO MY PRIVATE RESIDENCE AND SEIZING MY GRANDDAUGHTER S.G FOR THE PURPOSE OF SEARCHING HER MIND FOR INFORMATION WHILE I WAS NOT HOME WAS UNABLE TO CONSENT AND S.G BEING UNDER THE AGE OF 12 NOT BEING ABLE TO CONSENT.

THERE WAS NO PROBABLE CAUSE AS THE INITIAL REFERRAL STATED THE CALL WAS MY NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOR RETALIATING AGAINST ME. The COMPLAINT ALSO STATED POLICE WERE NOT NOTIFIED OR NEEDED AND COMPLAINT FURTHER STATED WAS NO IMMINENT threat. The kids were in school during buisness hours and could of gotten a warrant. The court house was open. NO NEED FOR A NIGHTTIME VISIT HOWEVER THEY CAME AT

NIGHT AND REMOVED THE CHILDREN UNDER IMMINENT DANGER WITH THE POLICE. TO SCARE MY GRANDCHILDREN WHILE THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE COMPLAINT TO MY KNOWLEDGE ARE NOT A VIOLATION OF ANY LAW or Rise to the level of imminent danger for sure.THERE BY VIOLATING MY 4TH AMENDMENT. SHOULD THIS CASE BE ABLE TO MOVE FORWARD I HAVE THE REFERRAL AND EVIDENCE TO PROVE MY CLAIM

. FURTHERMORE DETECTIVE McCUE FABRICATED OR SHOULD I SAY Lied TO CREATE CHARGES THAT DID NOT EXIST AS A WAY TO BE ABLE TO ARREST ME AND DENYING MY LIBERTY. I WAS CHARGED WITH PHYSICAL ABUSE OF A CHILD CAUSING GREAT BODILY HARM. NOT ONLY WAS THERE NOT GREAT BODILY HARM, THERE WAS NO HARM, NOT EVEN A RED MARK. HE ALSO CHARGED ME WITH EMOTIONAL TRAUMA TO A CHILD AND HE WAITED TILL AFTER THEY WERE EXAMINED SO HE WAS FULLY AWARE NONE OF THE CHILDREN Suffered EMOTIONAL TRAUMA AND WERE DEEMED NOT TO BE CONSIDERED HARMED AT ALL AND NOT CONSIDERED TO BE VICTIMS AT ALL. YET HE STILL ARRESTED ME AND DENIED ME MY LIBERTY FROM JAIL AND FURTHER VIOLATING MY LIBERTY FROM ME BEING ON BAIL FOR 2 YRS. AND CONDITIONS OF BAIL. (3)DEFENDANT MANITOWOC PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR FALSE IMPRISONING MY

GRANDCHILDREN WITHOUT A WARRANT OR COURT ORDER, ON THE  
SAY SO OF BRIANNA ZIPPERER AND DAVE MCCUE NOT TO RELEASE  
THEM EXCEPT TO POLICE Or A CPS WORKER DENYING THEIR  
FREEDOM..HERE'S WHERE THE REST OF MY DEFENDANTS COME INTO  
THE PICTURE.

ON DEC 20,2019 THE CHILDREN WERE PLACED IN FOSTER CARE  
AND THEY SAT THERE TILL JUN OF 2020, WITH NOT 1 HEARING  
OTHER THAN THE INITIAL 72HR HEARING. I KNOW THIS BECAUSE  
(4)defendant STEPHANIE WILLIS CPS WORKER (defendant  
4)INFORMED ME I COULD NOT BEGIN TO WORK ON MY  
REUNIFICATION PLAN BECAUSE THE JUDGE DID NOT ORDER THAT  
YET AND THE CHILDREN HAD NOT BEEN DEEMED TO BE IN NEED OF  
PROTECTION YET. SO SHE JUST TOLD ME WE HAVE NOT BEEN TO  
COURT FOR A DISPOSITIONAL HEARING OR PERMANENCY HEARING.  
So I ASKED HER WHAT ALL THE HEARINGS WERE ABOUT AND SHE  
SAID THOSE WERE EFFORTS TRYING TO TERMINATE MY  
GUARDIANSHIP. SO I HAD 3 OPEN CASES A CHIPS CASE, A  
GUARDIANSHIP CASE AND A CRIMINAL CASE WHICH I SHOULD NOTE  
THEY HAVE ALL CLOSED NOW. WHEN I SAY I WAS DENIED DUE  
PROCESS I MEAN I DON'T KNOW WHAT ALL THE HEARINGS WERE  
CALLED. ONLY THAT IN THE 3 CASES IN 2 YRS I HAVE NOT 1



---

TIME BEEN ABLE TO CALL A WITNESS CROSS EXAMINE A WITNESS  
SUBMIT A MOTION ( I submitted motions, but they went  
unanswered absolutely no RESPONSE)OR EVIDENCE. 3 TIMES I  
HAVE SUBPOENA WITNESSES AND 3 TIMES THEY WERE SQUASHED.

THE LAST TIME MY LAWYER REQUESTED MONEY TO HIRE A  
INVESTIGATOR TO LOCATE A WITNESS THAT WAS HIDING. HE  
APPROVED THE FUNDS WE LOCATED THE WITNESS THEN (5)  
defendant JUDGE ROHRER SQUASHED THAT WITNESS AFTER  
APPROVING THE FUNDS TO FIND HER AND NOW HE'S BILLING ME  
FOR THE INVESTIGATOR TO LOCATE LOCATE HER. EVEN THOUGH HE  
WOULDN'T LET ME CALL HER. NOW HE WANTS ME TO PAY FOR HER.  
THREE TIMES IN THIS 2 YRS I HAVE SUBPOENAED WITNESS AND  
THREE TIMES JUDGE ROHRER SQUASHED THEM. ON JUNE 25  
CORPORATE COUNSEL COERCED ME INTO TAKING A CHIPS CASE  
(DEFENDANT #3) PETER CONRAD TOLD ME IF I TOOK THE CHIPS  
AND DIDN'T GO TO TRIAL HE WOULD GIVE ME VISITS AND  
WITHDRAW THE MOTION TO TERMINATE MY GUARDIANSHIP if I  
didn't take the offer he'd make sure I never saw my  
grandkids again.. so far I haven't seen them at all..



SINCE THE KIDS WENT INTO FOSTERCARE DEC 20,2019 I HAD NOT  
HAD ANY CONTACT AT ALL SO I FELT I HAD TO TAKE THE CHIPS  
SO I COULD SEE MY GRANDKIDS. HE LIED I NEVER GOT VISITS  
AND HE TERMINATED MY GUARDIANSHIP WITH JUDGE ROHRER  
SIGNING AND AGREEING TO THAT BINDING CONTRACT HE  
TERMINATED MY GUARDIANSHIP CASE IN THE CRIMINAL CASE  
THEREBY AVOIDING THE TERMINATION HEARING ONCE AGAIN  
AVOIDING ME OF CALLING WITNESSES. Cross EXAMINE WITNESSES  
AND DISPROVING THE LIES STEPHANIE AND PETER CONRAD PUT AS  
REASONS TO TERMINATE. THEY TOLD THE COURT THEY WERE  
SEEKING TO TERMINATE MY GUARDIANSHIP EVEN THOUGH I TOOK  
THE CHIPS BECAUSE I AM TRYING TO PULL J.R OUT OF HIS  
SPECIAL ED SERVICES WHICH ARE NOT IN HIS BEST INTEREST.  
WHICH IS A BOLD FACE LIE SO I SUBPOENA THE DIRECTOR OF  
SPECIAL ED SERVICES TO TESTIFY I NEVER TRIED TO PULL HIM  
OUT OF SERVICES, BUT ONCE AGAIN JUDGE MARK ROHRER  
TERMINATED MY GUARDIANSHIP AND DENIED MY DUE PROCESS IN  
MY CRIMINAL CASE ONCE AGAIN AVOIDING ME CALLING ANY  
WITNESSES. IN THE CHIPS CASE. DEC 4TH WE HAD A PERMANENCY  
REVIEW HEARING AND PETER CONRAD OBJECTING TO ME BEING  
HEARD CALLING WITNESSES OR CROSS EXAMINING THEIR WITNESS  
I TOLD MARK ROHRER I WANTED TO CROSS EXAMINE THE COUNTIES  
WORKER AND MARK ROHRER SAID HE WOULD BE THE ONLY ONE

QUESTIONING CPS AND THAT I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO QUESTION  
HER..WHICH MEANS ALL THE LIES THEY TOLD WOULD GO  
UNCHALLENGED THEY STATED MY GRANDDAUGHTER MOLESTED HER

BROTHER BUT DENIED CPS HAD THEM SHARING A ROOM AND DENIED  
ANY OTHER BOY MOLESTED MY GRANDDAUGHTER WHICH GAVE HER  
THE EDUCATION DUE TO THEIR NOT FOLLOWING THE LAW. JUDGE  
ROHRER SAID I COULD HAVE MY HEARING ON DEC 18th ,2020  
WHERE I COULD CALL WITNESSES I SAID O THANK GOD IT WILL  
BE THE FIRST TIME SINCE THIS CASE OPENED THAT I WILL  
FINALLY BE HEARD!! WRONG AGAIN I HAVE MY WITNESS SUBPOENA  
PAID FOR THEM AGAIN I ARIVE AT COURT AND JUDGE ROHRER  
SAID WE WONT BE TAKING UP MISS HOWELLS MOTION TODAY I  
SAID OF COURSE NOT. JUDGE ROHRER THEN SAYS I'M HAVING  
QUESTIONS REGARDING MISS HOWELLS COMPETENCY SO I AM  
ORDERING HER TO HAVE A MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT IN HER  
CRIMINAL CASE. H÷ THEN LOOKS AT PETER CONRAD (DEFENDANT  
3) AND SAYS IF I FIND HER IMCOMPETENT IN THE CRIMINAL  
CASE I CAN THEN USE THAT TO TERMINATE HER GUARDIANSHIP IN  
THE GUARDIANSHIP AND CHIPS CASE CORRECT PETER CONRAD THEN  
SAID OH SURE. I THEN SAID HE ONLY WANTS ME EVALUATED IN  
THE CRIMINAL BECAUSE HE DOESN'T WANT TO LOOK RETALIATORY

---

SINCE ONLY 7 DAYS AGO I ASKED HIM TO RECUSE HIMSELF FOR  
THE 4 TIME. ALSO I DONT KNOW HOW I CAN BE INCOMPETENT IN  
THE CRIMINAL CASE SINCE I NEVER ATTENDED ANY HEARINGS ON  
THE CRIMINAL CASE. MY LAWYER THEN POP UP AND SAID I NEED  
TO CREATE A RECORD THAT MY CLIENT IS NOT INCOMPETENT AND  
IS ABLE TO ASSIST ME IN HER DEFENSE QUITE NICELY. ALSO  
LESS THAN 30 DAYS AGO YOU HAD HER DO A MENTAL HEALTH  
ASSESSMENT AND IT WAS FINE. THAT ASSESSMENT IS ON RECORD  
AND FILED WITH THE E FILER I SAID HES DR SHOPPING TO FIND  
SOMEONE THAT WILL SAY I'M A NUT. SO I NEVER GOT TO CALL  
MY WITNESSES IN THE CHIPS CASE AGAIN. I DID THE 2ND  
MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT AND THE FIRST WAS GOOD BUT THE  
SECOND WAS BETTER.

THEN THE DA OFFERED ME A PLEA SHE WOULD DROP THE 3  
FELONIES CAUSING EMOTIONAL TRAUMA TO A CHILD TO 2 COUNTS  
OF NEGLECT ( ALTHOUGH I SHOULD OF KNOWN THAT COULD CAUSE  
HARM) (BUT IT DIDN'T CAUSE HARM)AND (1 COUNT OF D/C )ALL  
MISDEMEANORS WHERE NOT 1 CHILD WAS INJURED THE D/C YOU  
CAN BE GUILTY OF RAISING YOUR VOICE. SO I TOOK IT AND  
SINCE JUDGE ROHRER COULD NOT FIND ME IMCOMPETENT HE  
TERMINATED MY GUARDIANSHIP IN THE CRIMINAL CASE DENYING

MY DUE PROCESS IN THE GUARDIANSHIP CASE WHERE NOW JUDGE  
ROHRER HAS SQUASHED THE WITNESS IN THAT CASE AND  
TERMINATED MY GUARDIANSHIP AND BY TERMINATED MY  
GUARDIANSHIP CASE HE ENDED MY CHIPS CASE AS WELL. IM  
REFILING TO CORRECT CHANGES MADE SINCE THE LAST ONE WAS  
DISMISSED. MY CASE WAS OPENED WHEN I FIRST FILES, BECAUSE  
I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT THE DEADLINE WAS. IM FILING BY MYSELF  
THE COURT SAID THE OTHERS COULDN'T BE ON MY CASE BECAUSE  
WE DIDN'T HAVE A LAWYER.

1.)Says hearing should be in 24 hrs we had ours at 72  
hrs.

30 days from last day of  
adjudicatory hearing Case Plan  
submitted 60 days Review Within 90 days  
(never had)

---

6 months after the child's removal  
from the home, (1st time in court )they  
called it a plea and made me take it or I  
would never see the kids again) and they  
would terminate my guardianship

Judicial Review Within 6 months after  
the initial review of permanency done  
at 12 mo and I was not allowed to testify  
call witnesses or cross examine the  
worker. Judge Rohrer refused to allow  
anyone to talk. HELD ON DEC 4th

OR every 90 days if Judicial  
Review/Permanency Hearing Within 12  
months after date child placed in  
shelter, never allowed to be heard (would

**not allow me to make a statement or call  
a witness to prove they were lying. Was  
on DEC 18TH NOT ALLOWED TO BE HEARD TOLD  
THE REST OF THE PEOPLE HE WAS HAVING MY  
COMPETENCE EVALUATED IN ANOTHER CASE  
ORDERD IT SEALD THEN TOLD EVERYONE IN THE  
CHIPS ABOUT IT.**