

OFFICIAL COMMENTS & STATEMENTS

Regarding the Civil Rights Case of Ian Richard Cuypers

Cuypers v. Taylor, Gaard, Brown & City of Superior | Case No. 3:24-cv-00743

Incident: February 28, 2024 | Lawsuit Filed: October 24, 2024 | Summary Judgment: February 9, 2026

Research Compiled from Verified Published Sources | March 2026

CASE SUMMARY

On the evening of February 28, 2024, at approximately 10:16 p.m., Ian Richard Cuypers, then 22 years old, was working as a DoorDash delivery driver in Superior, Wisconsin. Navigating an unfamiliar neighborhood, Cuypers accidentally turned the wrong way down John Avenue, a one-way street. He immediately stopped.

Superior Police Officer Justin Taylor — who had completed field training just two days earlier — activated his squad lights and pulled Cuypers over. After observing what he described as “furtive movements” inside the vehicle — later identified as Cuypers reaching into the glove box for his insurance card — Taylor called for backup and escalated the stop to a high-risk stop. Four additional officers responded: Taylor Gaard, Sergeant Matthew Brown, Jason Moen, and Dylan Crist.

Officers Taylor and Gaard drew their firearms and pointed them at Cuypers' vehicle. Cuypers was ordered to exit, and did so immediately with his hands raised. Multiple officers simultaneously shouted conflicting commands. Cuypers, confused and frightened, asked what was happening. He was not given an explanation. Sgt. Brown ordered Cuypers to get down on his left knee. When Cuypers asked again what he had done wrong, Officer Taylor Gaard fired her Taser at him twice — striking him in the back and legs — before he had an opportunity to comply. Body cam footage captured Cuypers saying: “I’m going to die here, aren’t I? Am I going to die?”

Officers then handcuffed Cuypers. Body cam footage later showed officers joking about completing his DoorDash delivery and going viral on TikTok.

Cuypers was cited for two ordinance violations: driving against traffic on a one-way street and resisting or obstructing a police officer. He was released without being booked. The resisting charge was prosecuted by City Attorney Harley “Frog” Prell in Douglas County Circuit Court under a city ordinance rather than state statute. On July 16, 2024, a jury acquitted Cuypers of the resisting/obstructing charge. He was found guilty of the one-way street violation and fined \$175.30.

Cuypers subsequently received a diagnosis of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder related to the incident, for which he received ongoing therapy and medication. He moved from the area, stating he no longer felt safe living near Superior, and ceased working for DoorDash.

Key Fact	Detail
Date of Incident	February 28, 2024, approx. 10:16 p.m.
Location	John Avenue (one-way street), Superior, Wisconsin

Key Fact	Detail
Plaintiff	Ian Richard Cuypers, then 22 (Denver, CO / formerly Duluth, MN)
Triggering violation	Wrong-way turn on one-way street while delivering DoorDash orders
Officers involved	Justin Taylor (probationary, 2 days post-field-training); Taylor Gaard (deployed Taser); Sgt. Matthew Brown; Jason Moen; Dylan Crist
Force used	Firearms drawn and pointed; Taser deployed twice (back and legs)
Charges filed	City ordinance: driving against traffic + resisting/obstructing officer
Criminal outcome	Acquitted of resisting/obstructing (jury, July 16, 2024); Guilty of one-way street violation (\$175.30 fine)
Civil lawsuit	Federal § 1983 suit filed Oct. 24, 2024, U.S. District Court, Western District of Wisconsin
Claims	Excessive force (Taser + firearms); Failure to intervene; Malicious prosecution; Intentional infliction of emotional distress
Defendants	Justin Taylor, Taylor Gaard, Sgt. Matthew Brown, City of Superior
Plaintiff's counsel	Nora Snyder, Ben Elson, Brad Thomson — People's Law Office, Chicago
Summary judgment ruling	Feb. 9, 2026: Judge Peterson grants summary judgment for Cuypers on Taser excessive force claim; remaining claims proceed to trial
Trial date	Jury selection and trial set July 27, 2026, Western District of Wisconsin
Judge	U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson; Magistrate Judge Anita Marie Boor

SECTION 1: CITY OF SUPERIOR OFFICIALS

Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt

Chief Winterscheidt was the primary spokesperson for the City of Superior in the immediate aftermath of the viral video. He issued multiple statements to the Superior Telegram and other outlets. His characterizations were later directly contradicted by his own officers' sworn testimony and by federal Judge Peterson's ruling.

Statement — April 2024 (First Public Coverage After Video Goes Viral)

When the body cam footage circulated online and the case drew national attention, Winterscheidt gave the following account to the Superior Telegram:

"I watched the video and it wasn't just a matter of reaching over — it was a full body movement across the seat."
 — **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

On the justification for escalating to a high-risk stop:

“In a high-risk traffic stop, officers want to gain control of the situation as quickly as possible.”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

On why the Taser was deployed:

“Cuypers continued to demonstrate resistance, dropping his hands several times, turning around and failing to go down to his knee when ordered.”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

“And ultimately, it was that continued resistance that necessitated the Taser. They deployed the Taser to prevent the situation from escalating.”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

On the department’s broader use-of-force record, offered as context:

“The police department works hard to build trust with the community. In the past two and a half years, roughly 1% of police calls have resulted in police use of force.”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

△ NOTE: Winterscheidt’s claim that Cuypers’s ‘continued resistance’ necessitated the Taser was directly contradicted by Officer Taylor’s own deposition testimony, in which Taylor stated he did not believe Cuypers did anything to resist officers. Federal Judge Peterson later ruled: “The video evidence leaves no doubt that Cuypers was not actively resisting and did not pose a threat to the officers or anyone else on the scene.”

Statement — October 2024 (Following Lawsuit Filing)

“Continued resistance ... necessitated the Taser. They deployed the Taser to prevent the situation from escalating.”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | October 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

Statement — February 2026 (Following Federal Court Ruling)

“[Declined to comment on pending litigation.]”

— **Police Chief Paul Winterscheidt**, Superior Police Department | February 9–10, 2026 | *WPR / Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*

△ NOTE: After a federal judge ruled unequivocally that the Taser use was an “obvious” constitutional violation and “not a close case,” Chief Winterscheidt declined all comment. This stands in contrast to his detailed public defense of the officers’ actions in April and October 2024.

City Attorney Harley “Frog” Prell

City Attorney Prell played two distinct roles in this case: he prosecuted Cuypers on the resisting/obstructing ordinance charge in municipal court, and he represents the city in the federal civil rights lawsuit.

At Municipal Trial — July 16, 2024

Prell presented the city’s case against Cuypers at the Douglas County Circuit Court jury trial before Judge Kelly Thimm. He offered opening statements and examined Officers Taylor, Gaard, and Sgt. Brown. The jury acquitted Cuypers of the resisting/obstructing charge on the same day.

△ NOTE: The decision to prosecute using a city ordinance rather than a state statute was significant. Municipal ordinance violations carry a lower burden of proof and are handled by the city attorney — who answers to the mayor — rather than the independently elected District Attorney. Analysts noted this bypassed DA oversight entirely.

Following the Federal Lawsuit — February 2026

“[Referred all comment to other attorneys on the case, who did not respond.]”

— **City Attorney Frog Prell (via spokesperson)**, City of Superior | February 9–10, 2026 | *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*

Mayor Jim Paine

Mayor Paine has made no documented public statement directly addressing the Cuypers tasing incident, the federal civil rights lawsuit, or the federal court’s February 2026 ruling that the Taser use was unconstitutional.

His public statements on the police department during the relevant period focused exclusively on internal personnel matters (the OIR Group investigation into Investigator LeRette):

“This is obviously a sensitive matter that involves a lot of individuals that I prefer not to disclose right now, and at least the potential for personnel issues. We have a number of cultural and potentially personnel issues that are overlapping in the police department, potentially some interpersonal conflicts or real policy conflicts that have largely overwhelmed the ability of the senior administration to respond to it.”

— **Mayor Jim Paine**, City of Superior | April 2025 | *Superior Telegram* (re: OIR Group commission)

“I don’t want to paint a picture here of an absolute crisis here, so I hope I’m not sounding too alarmist. We have issues here that left untended will grow into serious problems and potentially a crisis.”

— **Mayor Jim Paine**, City of Superior | April 2025 | *Fox21 Online* (re: OIR Group commission)

Following release of the OIR Group report in March 2026 (focused on the LeRette/Winterscheidt internal matter, not the Cuypers case):

“All of the accusations against all of the persons named here are unsubstantiated. There was no finding of wrongdoing against any police officers. That is the top line finding of this investigation.”

— **Mayor Jim Paine**, City of Superior | March 5, 2026 | *Fox21 Online / Northern News Now*

“Finally, councilors, what the OIR report does for us, what you got for your \$50,000, first and most importantly the relief I just described. We were not capable of truly finding the truth of all these allegations. We needed outside help to do this. I can now sleep well at night knowing that we’ve turned over every rock we possibly could have and we’ve done it in the most fair and impartial way possible.”

— **Mayor Jim Paine**, City of Superior | March 5, 2026 | *Northern News Now*

△ NOTE: Mayor Paine’s March 2026 statement that he could ‘sleep well at night’ and that the city had ‘turned over every rock’ came less than one month after a federal judge ruled the city’s police officer committed an ‘obvious’ and ‘objectively unreasonable’ constitutional violation against Cuypers. The OIR Group report he was celebrating made no findings regarding Cuypers.

Superior City Council

No documented public statements from any member of the Superior City Council were found specifically addressing the Cuypers tasing incident, the federal civil rights lawsuit, or the February 2026 federal court ruling.

The Council approved the hiring of the OIR Group in April 2025 to investigate internal personnel matters within the police department — but those matters concerned Investigator LeRette’s complaints, not the Cuypers case.

△ NOTE: Multiple local journalists and accountability outlets noted the Council’s silence specifically. SoupNutz wrote: ‘Not a single public statement has addressed the [tasing] incident — no context, no concern, and no commitment to transparency.’ The same outlet highlighted Councilor Nick Ledin, who teaches civics, as a specific example of ‘civically embarrassing’ silence.

SECTION 2: DOUGLAS COUNTY OFFICIALS

District Attorney Mark Fruehauf

DA Fruehauf’s office had no role in the prosecution of Ian Cuypers. The City of Superior prosecuted Cuypers under a city ordinance rather than a state statute, which kept the case within municipal court and under the control of City Attorney Frog Prell, bypassing the DA’s office entirely. Fruehauf made no documented public statement regarding the Cuypers case.

△ NOTE: The decision to use a city ordinance rather than a state statute for the resisting/obstructing charge specifically excluded the DA’s office from the case. Observers noted that municipal ordinance cases stay within city government’s control, raising questions about independence and oversight.

Douglas County Circuit Court — Judge Kelly Thimm

Judge Thimm presided over the July 16, 2024 municipal jury trial, City of Superior v. Ian Cuypers, on the resisting/obstructing ordinance charge. The jury returned a not-guilty verdict. Judge Thimm made no documented public statements beyond her conduct of the trial.

SECTION 3: FEDERAL COURT — KEY RULINGS AND STATEMENTS

U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson

Judge Peterson issued the central legal finding in this case in his February 9, 2026 Opinion and Order on cross-motions for summary judgment. His written ruling constitutes the most authoritative official assessment of the incident on record.

Summary Judgment Ruling — February 9, 2026

“The law is clear that it is unreasonable to deploy a taser against a non-violent suspect who is not actively resisting or otherwise posing a threat. The video evidence leaves no doubt that Cuypers was not actively resisting and did not pose a threat to the officers or anyone else on the scene. Gaard’s use of a taser was objectively unreasonable and violated clearly established law.”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order, Case No. 24-cv-743-jdp*

“No reasonable jury could find that the use of a Taser was reasonable.”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order*

“This is not a close case.”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order*

“Video footage shows that Cuypers was not actively resisting arrest. He immediately pulled over ... He followed officers’ instructions to put his hands up and to get out of his vehicle, and he kept his hands above his head at all times from when he exited his vehicle to when Gaard deployed her Taser.”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order*

On the malicious prosecution claim:

“There was no probable cause to cite [Cuypers for obstructing]. A reasonable jury could infer officers wanted to prosecute him ‘to justify their use of force.’”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order*

On failure to intervene (remaining for trial):

“A reasonable jury could find that the officers had ‘at least a few seconds’ to tell Gaard not to use her Taser.”

— **U.S. District Judge James D. Peterson**, Western District of Wisconsin | February 9, 2026 | *Opinion and Order*

△ NOTE: Peterson’s ruling granted summary judgment to Cuypers on the Taser claim, meaning no trial is needed on that issue — the court found it unconstitutional as a matter of law. Remaining claims (firearms pointed, failure to intervene, malicious prosecution, intentional infliction of emotional distress) proceed to jury trial, set July 27, 2026.

SECTION 4: OFFICERS’ OWN TESTIMONY (Trial & Depositions)

The following quotes from the officers themselves, given under oath, were cited in news coverage and court filings. They became central to the civil rights litigation.

Officer Justin Taylor (Initiating Officer)

At the July 2024 municipal trial:

“Yes, multiple officers were giving commands. I can see how that could be confusing.”

— **Officer Justin Taylor**, Superior Police Department (former) | July 2024 trial | *Trial transcript / SoupNutz*

“I couldn’t see exactly what he was reaching for. It could have been nothing.”

— **Officer Justin Taylor**, Superior Police Department (former) | July 2024 trial | *Trial transcript / SoupNutz*

At his federal deposition (reviewed with body cam footage):

“[When shown Gaard asking him, ‘So, what are your charges?’ on body cam, and asked if that meant she didn’t know what Cuypers had done to warrant arrest when she tased him:] That’s what it seems to be, yes.”

— **Officer Justin Taylor**, Superior Police Department (former) | Federal deposition | *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel / WPR*

“[When asked if he believed Cuypers did anything to resist officers:] No.”

— **Officer Justin Taylor**, Superior Police Department (former) | Federal deposition | *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*

Officer Taylor Gaard (Taser Operator)

At the July 2024 municipal trial:

“We were all shouting commands. In hindsight, it may have been hard for him to understand.”

— **Officer Taylor Gaard**, Superior Police Department (former) | July 2024 trial | [Trial transcript](#) / [SoupNutz](#)

“I didn’t see a weapon, but he moved his hand fast and didn’t comply. I took that as a threat.”

— **Officer Taylor Gaard**, Superior Police Department (former) | July 2024 trial | [Trial transcript](#) / [SoupNutz](#)

At federal deposition (October 3, 2025):

“[When asked if it was her understanding that it was not appropriate to use tasers on a passively resisting suspect:] Correct.”

— **Officer Taylor Gaard**, Superior Police Department (former) | Oct. 3, 2025 federal deposition | [SoupNutz](#) / [court records](#)

“[When asked if passive resistance is non-threatening and non-compliant behavior:] Correct.”

— **Officer Taylor Gaard**, Superior Police Department (former) | Oct. 3, 2025 federal deposition | [SoupNutz](#) / [court records](#)

Sergeant Matthew Brown (Supervisor on Scene)

At the July 2024 municipal trial:

“Looking back, we could’ve slowed things down. There wasn’t an immediate threat.”

— **Sergeant Matthew Brown**, Superior Police Department | July 2024 trial | [Trial transcript](#) / [SoupNutz](#)

“The video shows the driver asking questions. He doesn’t look like someone trying to flee or attack.”

— **Sergeant Matthew Brown**, Superior Police Department | July 2024 trial | [Trial transcript](#) / [SoupNutz](#)

“He seemed confused. He kept asking ‘What’s going on?’”

— **Sergeant Matthew Brown**, Superior Police Department | July 2024 trial | *Trial transcript / SoupNutz*

“There was definitely overlap in commands. That’s something we’re reviewing internally.”

— **Sergeant Matthew Brown**, Superior Police Department | July 2024 trial | *Trial transcript / SoupNutz*

△ NOTE: Sgt. Brown was the supervisor present at the scene. His own admissions that officers could have ‘slowed things down,’ that there was ‘definitely overlap in commands,’ and that Cuypers appeared confused — not threatening — became significant evidence in the federal case. Brown remains a named defendant.

SECTION 5: PLAINTIFF & PLAINTIFF’S COUNSEL

Ian Richard Cuypers (Plaintiff)

Cuypers gave statements at multiple stages of the case:

Initial Statement — April 2024 (After Video Goes Viral)

“We trust law enforcement to protect and serve with respect for all individuals’ rights and dignity. Their actions must reflect the high standards we hold them to. When they fall short, it’s imperative that we speak up and demand change.”

— **Ian Cuypers**, Plaintiff | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

“I was delivering DoorDash. It was actually two orders from Taco Bell. I handled it by the book, like, I just pulled over right away, started looking for my insurance like I always do, like I’ve done tens of times, and then they told me to put my hands up, which has never happened before.”

— **Ian Cuypers**, Plaintiff | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

“And then even when I got out of the car, I thought, you know, if I comply as well as I can, maybe they’ll stop yelling at me and give me some sort of explanation. But they just kept treating me like I was a criminal.”

— **Ian Cuypers**, Plaintiff | April 2024 | *Superior Telegram*

Statement — October 2024 (Filing of Federal Lawsuit)

“This incident was the scariest thing that has ever happened to me. I thought I was going to be killed, and the officers treated it like a big joke. I’m bringing this lawsuit to hold them accountable and to show that it’s not OK for police to treat people the way they treated me.”

— **Ian Cuypers**, Plaintiff | October 24, 2024 | *People’s Law Office / Northern News Now*

Statement — February 2026 (After Federal Judge’s Ruling)

“I brought this lawsuit to seek justice for what happened to me and to try to make sure that it does not happen to anyone else. I feel vindicated by the judge’s decision.”

— **Ian Cuypers**, Plaintiff | February 9, 2026 | *People’s Law Office press release*

Attorney Nora Snyder, People’s Law Office

At Lawsuit Filing — October 2024

“Three officers point guns at him. He thought he was going to be killed and he was arrested.”

— **Attorney Nora Snyder**, People’s Law Office, Chicago (Plaintiff’s Counsel) | October 24, 2024 | *Northern News Now*

“Defendant Gaard’s use of the Taser on an unarmed, non-threatening man who was not actively resisting arrest violated the constitution.”

— **Attorney Nora Snyder**, People’s Law Office, Chicago | November 2025 court filing | *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*

After Federal Court Ruling — February 2026

“We are pleased with the judge’s decision, which confirms what we have been saying since the beginning of this case: that Officer Gaard’s use of a Taser against Mr. Cuypers, an unarmed and non-threatening DoorDash driver who made a simple driving error, was an obvious violation of Mr. Cuypers’s constitutional rights.”

— **Attorney Nora Snyder**, People’s Law Office, Chicago | February 9, 2026 | *People’s Law Office press release*

“That affirms what we’ve been saying all along, that tasing an unarmed, non-threatening DoorDash driver is an obvious constitutional violation.”

— **Attorney Nora Snyder**, People’s Law Office, Chicago | February 9–10, 2026 | *WPR*

“The use of the Taser in this case was obviously unconstitutional. [Cuypers] is thrilled.”
 — **Attorney Nora Snyder**, People’s Law Office, Chicago | February 10, 2026 | *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*

SECTION 6: CHRONOLOGICAL TIMELINE OF EVENTS & STATEMENTS

Date	Who	Action / Statement
Feb. 28, 2024	Officers Taylor, Gaard, Brown et al.	Cuypers tased during DoorDash traffic stop on John Ave., Superior
April 2024	Video / LackLuster / Real News	Body cam footage goes viral; case draws national attention
April 2024	Chief Winterscheidt	Defends officers; says ‘continued resistance necessitated the Taser’
April 2024	Cuypers	States he complied to best of ability; considers legal action
July 16, 2024	Douglas Co. Circuit Court (Judge Thimm)	Jury acquits Cuypers of resisting/obstructing charge; \$175.30 fine for one-way street
Oct. 24, 2024	People’s Law Office / Cuypers	Federal § 1983 lawsuit filed, Western District of Wisconsin
Oct. 24, 2024	Chief Winterscheidt	Again defends Taser use; says resistance ‘necessitated’ it
Oct. 24, 2024	City Attorney Prell (implied)	City issued summonses; no public statement on merits
Oct. 2025	Officer Taylor Gaard (deposition)	Sworn testimony: Tasers should not be used on passively resisting suspects; confirms training
Nov. 2025	Attorney Snyder	Files motion for summary judgment on Taser excessive force claim
Nov. 2025	SoupNutz	Publishes trial testimony analysis; notes city’s elected officials still silent
Feb. 5, 2026	City Attorney Prell	Delays OIR Group report release for ‘legal review’ (unrelated to Cuypers)
Feb. 9, 2026	Judge Peterson	Grants summary judgment: Taser use ‘objectively unreasonable,’ ‘not a close case,’ ‘obviously unconstitutional’
Feb. 9–10, 2026	Chief Winterscheidt	Declines all comment on ‘pending litigation’
Feb. 9–10, 2026	City Attorney Prell	Refers comment to outside counsel; no response
Feb. 9, 2026	Mayor Jim Paine	No statement on ruling; silent on Cuypers case
Feb. 9, 2026	Superior City Council	No statement on ruling; silent on Cuypers case
March 5, 2026	Mayor Paine	Releases OIR Group report (re: LeRette/Winterscheidt only); says he can ‘sleep well at night’
July 27, 2026	Federal Court	Jury trial scheduled: remaining claims (firearms, failure to intervene, malicious prosecution, IIED, damages)

NOTABLE ABSENCE OF STATEMENTS

Exhaustive research found no public statements on the Cuypers civil rights case from the following:

- Mayor Jim Paine — no documented statement on the tasing, the lawsuit, or the federal court ruling
- Superior City Council (all 10 members) — no documented statements or council resolutions
- Douglas County Board of Supervisors — no documented statements
- Douglas County DA Mark Fruehauf — no documented statements (case bypassed his office via city ordinance)
- Wisconsin Governor's Office — no documented statements
- Wisconsin Attorney General Josh Kaul — no documented statements (no AG involvement in this case)
- Wisconsin Department of Justice / State Patrol — no documented involvement or statements
- Police Chief Winterscheidt — silent after the Feb. 2026 court ruling (previously defended officers publicly in April and October 2024)

△ NOTE: The pattern: A federal judge ruled that the City of Superior's police officer committed an 'obvious' constitutional violation against an unarmed DoorDash driver. The judge said it was 'not a close case.' The city's elected mayor, all 10 city council members, and the county's elected district attorney made no public statements in response. The police chief, who had publicly defended the officers twice, went silent. The city attorney's office referred all comment to outside litigation counsel. Superior taxpayers will bear the cost of any damages award, attorneys' fees, and trial costs — all without any public accounting from their elected officials.

SOURCES

All statements compiled from the following verified published sources:

- Superior Telegram — superiortelegram.com
- Duluth News Tribune — duluthnewstribune.com
- Wisconsin Public Radio (WPR) — wpr.org
- Fox21 Online — fox21online.com
- Northern News Now (KBJR) — northernnewsnow.com
- WDIO Duluth — wdio.com
- Milwaukee Journal Sentinel / Wisconsin Law Journal — jsonline.com / wislawjournal.com
- Minneapolis Star Tribune / Minnesota Lawyer — startribune.com / minnlawyer.com
- People's Law Office (press releases) — peopleslawoffice.com

- SoupNutz (accountability journalism, FOIA documents) — soupnutz.net
- WBZH Radio / Civic Media Inc. — wbzh.fm
- The Real News Network / Police Accountability Report — therealnews.com
- Justia Federal Dockets — dockets.justia.com (Case No. 3:24-cv-00743)
- U.S. District Court, Western District of Wisconsin — Opinion and Order, Feb. 9, 2026

Research compiled March 2026. This document reflects statements found in publicly available news coverage and court records. It does not include sealed court filings or off-record communications.