

Office of the Clerk
WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS
110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688
Telephone (608) 266-1880
Facsimile (608) 267-0640
WEB SITE: www.courts.state.wi.us
DISTRICT II

July 31, 2001
To:

Jack D. Walker
Douglas E. Witte
Melli, Walker, Pease & Ruhly, S.C.
P.O. Box 1664
Madison, WI 53701-1664

Brett C. Petranech
Kelly & Petranech
122 East Olin Avenue, Ste. 195
Madison, WI 53713

William H. Ramsey
Asst. Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

[Decision No. 29659-E]

[NOTE: This document was re-keyed by WERC. Original pagination has been retained.]

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

01-0247	Racine Education Association v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission, et al.
---------	---

Before Nettesheim, J.

The issue in this appeal involves a proposal by the Racine Unified School District concerning in-service training for teachers. When the District and the Racine Education Association reached an impasse on the proposal, the District unilaterally implemented it. The dispute related to the parties' contracts for 1997-99 and 1999-2001.

The Milwaukee *Journal-Sentinel* has recently reported that a proposed contract between the parties was expected to be ratified on July 30, 2001. It appears that the issue presented in this appeal may be rendered moot by the settlement.

A matter is moot if a determination is sought which cannot have an effect on an existing controversy. See *City of Racine v. J-T Enterprises of America, Inc.*, 64 Wis. 2d 691, 700, 221 N.W.2d 869 (1974). A reviewing court will usually decline to address moot issues. See *State*

ex. rel. Wisconsin's Environmental Decade, Inc. v. JCRAR, 73 Wis. 2d 234, 236, 243 N.W.2d 497 (1976). All parties to this appeal are therefore directed to file responses on or before August 10, 2001, advising this court whether the proposed contract was ratified and, if so, whether the contract resolves the “in-service/impasse” issue addressed in the briefs.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that on or before August 10, 2001, the parties shall file responses advising this court whether the proposed contract was ratified and, if so, whether the contract resolves the “in-service/impasse” issue addressed in the briefs.

Cornelia G. Clark
Clerk of Court of Appeals