

**EVAN C. GOYKE**  
City Attorney

**MARY L. SCHANNING**  
**ROBIN A. PEDERSON**  
**NAOMI E. SANDERS**  
**JULIE P. WILSON**  
Deputy City Attorneys



Milwaukee City Hall Suite 800 • 200 East Wells Street • Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3551  
Telephone: 414.286.2601 • TDD: 414.286.2025 • Fax: 414.286.8550

**HEIDI WICK SPOERL**  
**KATHRYN Z. BLOCK**  
**THOMAS D. MILLER**  
**PETER J. BLOCK**  
**PATRICK J. MCCLAIN**  
**ANDREA J. FOWLER**  
**JOANNA FRACZEK**  
**HANNAH R. JAHN**  
**MEIGHAN M. ANGER**  
**ALEXANDER R. CARSON**  
**GREGORY P. KRUSE**  
**ALEX T. MUELLER**  
**ALEXANDER D. COSSI**  
**LISA A. GILMORE**  
**KATHERINE A. HEADLEY**  
**SHEILA THOBANI**  
**STACY J. MILLER**  
**JORDAN M. SCHETTLE**  
**THERESA A. MONTAG**  
**ALEXANDER E. FOUNDOS**  
**TRAVIS J. GRESHAM**  
**KYLE W. BAILEY**  
**JOSEPH M. DOBBS**  
**WILLIAM K. HOTCHKISS**  
**CLINT B. MUCHE**  
**TYLER M. HELSEL**  
**ZACHARY A. HATFIELD**  
**MEGHAN C. MCCABE**  
**MARIA E. MESOLORAS**  
**CYNTHIA HARRIS ORTEGA**  
**OLUWASEUN CHRIS IBITOYE**  
**KEVIN P. TODT**  
**NATHANIEL E. ADAMSON**  
**JUSTIN J. DREIKOSEN**  
Assistant City Attorneys

June 9, 2025

**VIA EMAIL ONLY -- [lelmer@milwaukee.gov](mailto:lelmer@milwaukee.gov)**

Administrative Review Board of Appeals  
Office of the City Clerk  
200 E. Wells St. Rm. 205  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Re: Nuisance property designation on 4102-4114 N. 27<sup>th</sup> St.  
File No. 25003

Dear Administrative Review Board of Appeals:

The Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) will call Officer Christopher Schlei and Detective Jake Puschnig at the upcoming hearing. MPD may call Officer Gussie Nelson and Detectives Steven Campbell and Adrian Gutierrez. The contact information for law enforcement is available upon request.

This letter will also serve as the Milwaukee Police Department's (MPD) reply to the May 30, 2025, submission in this matter.

### **October 26, 2024 Incident**

Appellants argue that the events of the after-set would not constitute nuisance activity as they relate all nuisance activity to the gunfire from a vehicle. Appellant's argument misses relevant facts.

One person inside the residence stated numerous people were armed and they heard a gunshot inside the residence. A separate witness heard a gunshot while inside the residence and did not hear any gunshots outside the residence. One witness looking outside stated that there was one gunshot that was followed by multiple other gunshots. Based on these facts, there was one round discharged inside the residence by a person attending an overcrowded after-set. The same witness stated that there were many people with guns in their pockets and waist. This would mean that they are at least partially concealed. The notice indicated that there were crimes involving illegal possession or use of firearms pursuant to MCO § 80-10-2-c-1-L.



MCO § 80-10-2-c-1-L defines the illegal possession/use of firearms with reference to Wis. Stat. ch. 941, and Wis. Stat. § 941.23 makes it illegal for individuals to carry a concealed firearm. Contrary to Appellant's assertions then, firearms in waistbands and pockets that were not readily observable until after the shooting would be concealed for purposes of Wis. Stat. § 941.23, and therefore also be a nuisance activity.

### **December 30, 2024 Incident**

Whether a person is a victim only matters when they are calling for assistance related to domestic abuse, stalking and sexual assault pursuant to City of Milwaukee § 80-10-2-c-2. Everything else is guided by whether the person engaging with the behavior is associated with the premises pursuant to § 80-10-2-c-1.

In this case, the visitor was the victim. Anyone can be a visitor by walking up on the sidewalk to the door and in this case, it began with a father attempting to see his daughter. With this visit, the father brought his previous relationship with the defendant. The violent history going back almost two years when the victim previously pistol-whipped and shot the defendant.

By pure happenstance, the defendant observed the victim walking to visit his daughter at this premises. The defendant then went to visit the visitor at the premises. The problem for Appellant's tenant is that the two have engaged in shooting each other and, unfortunately, that amounted to a homicide on that day. This problem, however, is what this tenant allowed to visit this premises.

We are all responsible for whom and what we bring to the door. This is consistent with the ordinance structure. It is likely a reason as to how criminal trespass is an allowable nuisance activity under the statute. How else could the nuisance activity of an allowed visitor/guest amount to trespassing? The answer is that we all have a responsibility for whom we allow into our home, whom those visitors/guests have visit, and what nuisance activity they conduct at the premises.

### **Conclusion**

In the end, there is a clear connection to the nuisance activity to the residents. The calls for service directly related to actions the residents have taken or their guests have taken. That is all that is required for a connection.

Very truly yours,

*Electronically signed by Nathaniel Adamson*

NATHANIEL ADAMSON  
Assistant City Attorney

c: Attorney Daniel Conway (via email only [Dconway@conwayjosetti.com](mailto:Dconway@conwayjosetti.com))  
Attorney Michael Pflugoefl (via email only [MPflughoeft@conwayjosetti.com](mailto:MPflughoeft@conwayjosetti.com))