

**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 4937 N. 39<sup>th</sup> St.  
File No. 24200

Dear Administrative Review Board of Appeals:

The Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) will call Officer Tiara Sheets-Walker at the upcoming hearing. MPD may also call Detectives Jonathan Bohn, Ryan Kramschuster and Michael Driscoll as well. 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.

### **August 18, 2024 Incident**

In the present case, it is very clear there was a relationship between all parties involved. One of Appellant's residents was set to receive a truck. The truck was loaned out as drug rental. The truck was then observed in the area on the day of the shooting and an attempt to recover the truck to Appellant's resident was unsuccessful.

Hours after the failed recovery, four men went to Appellant's premises, walked inside the building and walked directly upstairs to where Appellant's resident lives. One person relayed that they were 100% sure those people were there for them and recognized two of them from earlier. They were in a different and vacant apartment unit on the first floor of the same premises. The men eventually left.



Approximately 30 minutes later, the truck at issue was in front of Appellant's premises. Appellant's resident apparently went to the doorway where the eventual shooter confronted them about what was said previously. At that time, there were 4-5 gunshots.

From these facts alone, it is clear that one of Appellant's residents was associated with the people that discharged the firearm. The men knew where to find the people related to the ownership of the truck and went there after there was a discussion about the truck earlier in the day.

Moreover, the truck was referred to as a drug rental. This is clear from the fact that it was reported as a drug rental and there was no evidence anyone ever called the cops to report it stolen. Instead, there was a failed attempt to recover the vehicle from the associates and this caused them to go directly to this apartment.

The police were not called throughout the dispute regarding the drug rental and the disappearance of the vehicle. The residents never called the cops prior to the shooting. There were ongoing discussions between the associates about the property, which had a final meeting culminating

From these circumstances, it is clear that the residents of the premises considering these people some form of associate and this relationship makes them associated with the premises at the time of the shooting.

### **October 12, 2024 Incident**

Appellant egregiously mischaracterizes the facts in the reports. Appellant's tenant was fighting over issues related with Appellant's premises and tenant property. The physical fight regrettably escalated to firearm use. One of the women's boyfriends exited Appellant's premises with a firearm and discharged rounds. Police responded to this location and conducted an investigation at Appellant's premises. This is all that is required.

### **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 Pflugoef (via email only [MPflughoeft@conwayjosetti.com](mailto:MPflughoeft@conwayjosetti.com))