DODGE COUNTY, WISCONSIN

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Daniel L Siegmann,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

David Frohling and Danielle Van Egtern

 Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **I. NATURE OF ACTION**

 101. On August 16, 2022 David Frohling and Danielle Van Egtern violated Daniel L. Siegmann’s constitutionally-secured and protected right of free speech.

 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

 201. The Office of District Attorney of Dodge County, Wisconsin is the proper venue for this action because the Defendants’ violations occurred and the Plaintiff’s claim arose within the geographical boundaries of Dodge County, WI, and the District Attorney has taken an Oath of Office to support the Constitution of the state of Wisconsin and the Constitution of the United States.

 **Ⅲ. PARTIES**

 A. Plaintiff

 301. Plaintiff Daniel L. Siegmann is an adult resident of Dodge County in Wisconsin, the Dodge County Supervisor of District 10 of Dodge County, WI.

 B. Defendants

 302. David Frohling is an adult resident of Dodge County in Wisconsin, the Dodge County Supervisor of District 23 of Dodge County, WI, and the Chairman of the Dodge County Board of Supervisors.

 303. Defendant Van Egtern is a Clerk employed in the Dodge County, WI County Clerk Office.

**Ⅳ. ALLEGATIONS OF FACT AS TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

401. Plaintiff Siegmann found that he would not be able to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting of August 16, 2022 which began at 6:00pm.

 402. Plaintiff Siegmann had intended to distribute some of his written communication and speech by personal letter to his fellow supervisors prior to the meeting.

 403. This personal communication and speech by personal letter was contained in manila envelopes, one for each supervisor.

 404. Plaintiff Siegmann decided to get his written communication and speech to his fellow supervisors by having a 3rd party, Ajay Schnitzler, pick them up and deliver them.

 405. At or about 5:40pm Schnitzler arrived at the meeting and began to deliver the Plaintiff’s letters to the Supervisors, either handing it directly to them or placing it upon their personal desk in the meeting room (see video in flashdrive and Exhibit A – timeline of video)

 406. Defendants Frohling and Van Egtern began to walk along the Supervisor’s desks to take the Plaintiff’s personal letter of communication and speech and the manila envelopes which contained them into their personal possession.

 407. Defendants Frohling and Van Egtern demanded some supervisors to put the Plaintiff’s material back in the envelopes and hand it over to them.

 408. The Defendants took the Plaintiff’s property to their desk at the front of the room.

 409. Schnitzler gave the Plaintiff a call from his cell phone to inform the Plaintiff that the Defendants were taking his property which had been distributed to the supervisors.

 410. Schnitzler asked if the Plaintiff wanted to speak with Defendant Frohling and he answered in the affirmative.

 411. Plaintiff Siegmann told Defendant Frohling that the envelopes and their content were the Plaintiff’s property containing his speech and that Defendant Frohling could not take them. He had been warned. (Affidavit, Exhibit B)

 412. Defendants Frohling and Van Egtern kept the Plaintiff’s property containing his speech in their possession, refusing to allow the other supervisors to read it.

 **Ⅴ. VIOLATIONS OF LAW**

501. Defendants Frohling and Van Egtern are both held responsible to an Oath of Office which pledges to support our Federal and State Constitutions, Defendant Frohling as a Supervisor who took one personally and Defendant Van Egtern as an employee in the County Clerk’s Office working under the oath of her Supervisor, County Clerk Karen Gibson. The Plaintiff is a citizen of Dodge County who is representing many other citizens of Dodge County and has a right to speak concerning matters of public importance and public concern, especially so as a Supervisor representing a District on the Board of Supervisors. On August 16, 2022 Defendants Frohling and Van Egtern violated Article I, Section 3 of the Wisconsin State Constitution as well as the Oath of Office whereby they are sworn to support and defend it, when they confiscated the Plaintiff’s materials containing his free speech, infringing his right to “freely speak, write and publish his sentiments on all subjects…”.

 – PICKERING v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 391 U.S. 563 (1968)

 – GARCETTI v. CEBALLAS, 574 U.S. 410 (2006)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Daniel L. Siegmann Date

State of

County of

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2022 by Daniel L. Siegmann, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Notary Public (Seal)