_				
1	STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT MILWAUKEE COUNTY BRANCH 12			
2				
3	STATE OF WISCONSIN,			
4	Plaintiff,			
5				
6	v. CASE NO.: 2022-GF-110			
7				
8	RICKY DE LA ROSA,			
9	Petitioner.			
10				
11	GROUP FILE OF RICKY DE LA ROSA			
12				
13	MAY 16, 2022 HONORABLE DAVID L. BOROWSKI			
14				
15				
16	CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE PRESIDING			
17				
18	APPEARANCES:			
19	MR. ALEX MUELLER, Attorney at Law, appeared			
20	on behalf of the city of Milwaukee.			
21	MR. OWEN PIOTROWSKI, Attorney at Law, appeared			
22	on behalf of the state of Wisconsin.			
23				
24				
25	CAROLE SEROTA-BODI, RPR			
	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, BRANCH 12			
	-1-			

1	INDEX
2	EXAMINATION
3	(NONE)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	<u>EXHIBITS</u>
12	(NONE)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23	
24	
25	
	-2-

1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS: 2. In the Interest of Ricky De La THE CLERK: 3 Rosa, 2022-GF-110. 4 Appearances, please. 5 MR. MUELLER: Alex Mueller appears for the 6 city. 7 Good morning. 8 **THE COURT:** Mr. De La Rosa, state your name, 9 spell your first and last name for the record, please. 10 MR. DE LA ROSA: Ricky De La Rosa; 11 R-I-C-K-Y, D-E L-A R-O-S-A. 12 **THE COURT:** It's here on a property return. 13 Can I hear from the city? 14 MR. MUELLER: Yes. 15 This case was already before Your Honor. 16 This involves two firearms that were confiscated in 17 connection with a criminal investigation. That matter 18 was referred to the DA's office and no processed. 19 only thing barring the return at the last court date was 20 that Mr. De La Rosa did not have proof of ownership of 21 these firearms. 22. He has appeared today. He did show me 23 receipts and paperwork in connection with each of these 24 The serial numbers do match up, so it is my weapons.

opinion that he's likely met that burden.

25

1 2. circumstances, just out of curiosity that the State 3 decided to no process? 4 MR. MUELLER: 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 THE COURT: 15 16 17 18 19 20 maybe pointed his fingers at him. 21 22. case, Judge. 23

24

25

THE COURT: What was the underlying

The incident dates back to March 18th of this year. Officers responded to a subject with a gun. They made contact with the petitioner. He informed officers that he had fired his weapon in the air three to four times. He did so because an individual he knows followed him to his residence and rolled down his car window and made a gun gesture with his hand.

Mr. De La Rosa was arrested. These two firearms were confiscated, a referral was made to the DA's office, and that referral was no processed.

So, in that circumstance, the DA's office doesn't even charge disorderly conduct with a weapon among or other possible charges? That might explain situations like the Deer District on Friday. So. the DA's office has not charged someone who is firing weapons in the air or possibly at other people because he

MR. MUELLER: Yes. That appears to be the

MR. DE LA ROSA: Sir, it was in self-defense.

> Yes, of course, everything in THE COURT:

Milwaukee is self-defense now. 1 2. Please sit down. I'll think about it. 3 a seat. 4 (Whereupon, the proceedings were in 5 recess.) 6 THE CLERK: In the Interest of Ricky De La 7 Rosa, 22-GF-110. 8 Appearances, please. 9 MR. MUELLER: Alex Mueller for the State. 10 The petitioner appears in THE COURT: 11 person. 12 Can the city, again, tell me your 13 understanding of the underlying situation here, please? 14 MR. MUELLER: Yes, Judge. 15 Okay, so this case dates back to March 18th 16 of this year. Officers responded to a subject with a gun 17 complaint at 8921 West Hampton Avenue. It's there that 18 they made contact with the petitioner. He informed 19 officers that he intentionally fired his gun into the air 20 three to four times. He stated he discharged his firearm 21 because a subject he knows by the name of "Willy Brown" 22. followed him to his residence, and once at the residence 23 rolled down his car window and made a gun gesture with 24 his hand. Police placed the petitioner under arrest, and 25

two firearms were confiscated in connection with this

investigation.

2.

22.

There was a referral made to the DA's office for criminal charges. On March 19th the case was reviewed by ADA Zisi who no processed the case.

THE COURT: Is the city aware of any record for the defendant; meaning a felony that would prohibit him from owning?

MR. MUELLER: No.

THE COURT: I'm aware that on these property returns, generally we have certain criteria that need to be met; meaning the case was no processed, the city or the state, meaning the DA's office no longer needs the evidence, and proof of ownership, along with other matters. I don't have a lot of discretion and normally would be required to return the firearm or firearms.

However, in this case I want an appearance from the DA's office. There happens to be a DA sitting in court. It's not her issue. It's not her situation, but I'm going to ask her to advise — I'll have my clerk set this out about two weeks — that I want a supervisor from the DA's office in the unit that covers these to explain to me how charges were not filed.

Just off the top of my head, this is clearly disorderly conduct with a weapon. It could be recklessly endangering safety, among other crimes. And as I said

--

earlier, I will say again on the record, this is why we have situations like the Deer District on Friday.

I'm very displeased to hear about the charging decision or lack thereof. The DA's office it would appear — maybe I could be corrected or maybe there's information that I don't have — just decided to allow someone to engage in gunplay, fire shots in a residential neighborhood and just move on to the next case or the next no process.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were in recess.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

The DA's office has officially appeared on this case. I'll ask counsel to make a record on what the DA's office has advised relative to this case and the potential need for the weapons and the decision or lack of decision regarding charges being filed.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Yes, Judge. Owen
Piotrowski appearing for the Milwaukee County District
Attorney's office.

Judge, in response to the court's concerns — And I can also tell you, typically, the Milwaukee Police Department when they get these gun return referrals makes my office aware that a petition has been filed. That did not happen in this case, so the

1 2.

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

court's concerns this morning were the first I had become aware of it.

I came up. I've had a chance to review the police reports, and this case was initially reviewed by a relatively new person in my office. At this point I haven't had a chance to review it to determine that the qun is not needed as evidence in any other cases and no final decision has been made as to whether criminal charges would be issued in this case.

By statute, I'm sure as Attorney Mueller has noted, the DA's office has 10 months to make a charging decision before a gun would be returned by statute. We're still I believe within that time frame of this case.

So based on that your office is THE COURT: opposed to the return, at least for now, correct?

> MR. PIOTROWSKI: At this point, yes, Judge. THE COURT: All right.

Mr. De La Rosa, what that means is there may have been a mistake here or someone may not have gotten the appropriate information, but normally the Milwaukee Police Department who confiscated the weapons tells the DA's office not just about the potential charges and tells the city attorney's office about these hearings, they are also supposed to tell the DA's office and the

city attorney's office about (a), the possible charges, and (b), a request like this to return property.

The State is telling me they are opposed to the return of property. I'm also opposed to the return of the property. Based on the statute, the DA's office has time. They still have a number of months where they can decide whether or not to issue charges related to these guns.

I certainly am still concerned about the underlying charging decision, but pursuant to statute they have additional time to hold the guns, hold the weapons, and decide if there are any charges that are going to be filed. They may issue charges that I mentioned earlier. There might be other crimes related to these guns or there might not.

So that means for right now, I'm denying the return of property. If the statutory time frame runs, if the State, ultimately, decides that there are no charges related to either of these weapons, you could then refile a petition, but that would be months from now some time after the 10-month limit. I'll sign an order to that effect.

Mr. De La Rosa, have a seat in the back. We'll give you the paperwork.

Do you understand?

1		MR. DE LA ROSA: Yeah.
2		THE COURT: Great. I'll sign an order.
3		Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate you
4	coming up.	
5		MR. PIOTROWSKI: No problem, Judge.
6		
7		(proceedings concluded)
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		-10-

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN)		
2	COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE)		
3			
4	I, CAROLE SEROTA-BODI, an Official		
5	Court Reporter for the circuit court of Milwaukee County,		
6	Branch 12, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true		
7	and accurate transcript of my original Stenographic notes		
8	taken on the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.		
9	Dated this 15th day of June,		
10	2022, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	Carole Serota-Bodi, RPR Official Court Reporter, Branch 12		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			