

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS

Madeline Sally Machla Lee,

Respondent,

vs.

Kellye Strickland,

Appellant.

ORDER

#A25-1655

BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:

1. In this appeal, appellant challenges an order the district court filed in August 2025. Among other rulings, that order denied appellant's (second) motion to vacate a 2024 harassment restraining order (HRO). A related appellate matter was A25-1485.
2. Pending this appeal, respondent moved the district court to hold appellant in contempt of court for violating the HRO.
3. On January 2, 2026, the district court set an evidentiary hearing for January 22, 2026, and directed appellant to show cause why aspects of appellant's conduct do not violate the HRO. The order also directs appellant to remove certain material from a website.
4. Appellant asks us to stay enforcement of the January 2, 2026 order, and to stay or vacate the hearing set for January 22, 2026. We received no response to the motion.
5. This appeal is limited to review of the district court's August 2025 order.
6. Because appellant cites no authority addressing stays pending appeal, the question of a stay pending appeal is inadequately briefed. *See State, Dep't of Labor &*

Indus. v. Wintz Parcel Drivers, Inc., 558 N.W.2d 480, 480 (Minn. 1997) (declining to address an inadequately briefed issue); *Skyberg v. Orlich*, 10 N.W.3d 303, 309 n.6 (Minn. App. 2024) (citing *Wintz*). Thus, even if enforcement of the 2024 HRO—which is *not* being challenged in this appeal—was properly before us now, relief would not be proper.

7. We note a final contempt order is appealable. *Time-Share Sys., Inc. v. Schmidt*, 397 N.W.2d 438, 440 (Minn. App. 1986); *see Paulson v. Johnson*, 7 N.W.2d 338, 339 (Minn. 1943) (“[a]n order requiring defendant to do a certain act and if he fail[s] to do it to show cause why he should not be adjudged in contempt is not a final order and is not appealable” (syllabus)); *Maher v. Maher*, 393 N.W.2d 190, 195 (Minn. App. 1986) (stating an order finding a party in contempt and directing immediate incarceration is appealable).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Appellant’s motion for a stay is denied.
2. We express no opinion on the merits of this appeal. Nor do we express an opinion on any matter to be decided by the district court.
3. The clerk of the appellate courts shall provide copies of this order to the Honorable Nicole Starr, Referee Jenese Larmouth, the self-represented appellant, counsel for respondent, and the district court administrator.

Dated: January 27, 2026

BY THE COURT



Jennifer L. Frisch
Chief Judge