

If you'd like to contact the Wisconsin Attorney General (Josh Kaul) about Zachariah Anderson, please click [this link](#). Scroll down to the middle of the page and provide your contact info before copying and pasting the form letter into the text box.

Feel free to add your own thoughts to the letter, or simply leave as-is.

If you'd prefer to send the letter in by certified mail, the official address of the Wisconsin DOJ office can be found below:

Wisconsin Department of Justice

P.O. Box 7857

Madison, WI 53707-7857

The goal of this letter is to trigger an investigation into Zachariah Anderson's case by The Wisconsin Office of the Attorney General. They will be the best equipped to act upon the information contained herein, if they are so compelled.

The best way to ensure visibility is to get as many people as possible to contact them.

To: Josh Kaul
Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

From:

Dear Mr. Kaul,

I am reaching out to you regarding Kenosha County Case 2020CF1435- State v. Zachariah Anderson. A jury trial was originally scheduled to begin on March 14, 2022, however a mistrial was ordered after it was discovered during opening statements that Kenosha County District Attorney, Michael Graveley, had personally failed to turn material evidence over to the defense. The case was retried on February 27, 2023 and guilty verdicts were returned on all counts despite numerous clear and substantial violations of Mr. Anderson's constitutional rights.

As a concerned citizen and member of the general public, I believe it is my duty to bring to your attention a number of significant concerns I have regarding District Attorney Michael Graveley's conduct during the case; as well as Judge Bruce Schroeder and other individuals employed by the Kenosha County Circuit Court. Many additional concerns exist beyond those listed below that not only question the personal and professional ethics of those involved, but also challenge public faith in the integrity of the Wisconsin judicial system as a whole. However, I believe that the issues identified below are the most concerning, and demand immediate attention:

1. Mr. Anderson was **denied his right to a speedy trial:**

1. Mr. Anderson filed his first Speedy Trial Demand with the court on December 14, 2021. Mr. Anderson's original March 14, 2022 jury trial date would have been within the speedy trial time limits. However, as mentioned above, a mistrial had to be ordered because DA Graveley failed to meet his ethical obligations.
2. Mr. Anderson reasserted his right to a speedy trial on March 14, 2022; however, it was denied to him by Judge Bruce E. Schroeder and a new trial date was scheduled.
3. On August 24, 2022, Mr. Anderson, once again, demanded his right to a Speedy Trial. His constitutional rights were again denied to him, but this time by Kenosha County Chief Judge Jason A. Rossell.
4. Despite being repeatedly denied his constitutional right to a speedy trial, Judge Anthony Milisaukas refused to lower Mr. Anderson's bond on September 7, 2022.
5. Mr. Anderson next filed a Petition for Habeas Corpus on September 13, 2022 asking that his Speedy Trial Demand be enforced or that he be released from pretrial custody. (Kenosha County 2022CV955)

6. Judge David Wilk denied Mr. Anderson's request Petition for Habeas Corpus on November 21, 2022.

2. DA Graveley took so long in his case-in-chief, that it **interfered with the defense witnesses' availability**. The most egregious example of the impact of his untimeliness includes allowing a subpoena for Detective Lorn Anschutz to expire, which enabled the Detective to leave the state and avoid service. Without Detective Anschutz available to testify, material facts pertinent to the case went unheard by the jury, which negatively impacted its overall understanding of important issues undermining the State's case.

3. **Despite the fact that a mistrial was previously granted** because DA Graveley failed to comply with his ethical, and statutory discovery obligations, **Graveley still failed to turn all material evidence over to the defense** prior to retrial on February 27, 2023. This withheld evidence included relevant cell phone data reports and a receipt confirming Mr. Anderson had an alibi at the time the charged offenses allegedly occurred. However, Graveley only turned this evidence over to Mr. Anderson *after* the missing documents were discovered (by the Defense) during the retrial. Despite such a clear **Brady** violation, no sanctions were ordered against Graveley, or anyone else from the Kenosha County District Attorney's Office.

4. DA Graveley **made himself a material witness** in the retrial and was included on Mr. Anderson's witness list. He was excluded from the courtroom during the questioning of a State's witness because of this involvement. Yet, Judge Bruce Schroeder did not remove Graveley as lead prosecutor on the case or subject him to additional witness sequestration like all other listed witnesses; but instead allowed him to continue to prosecuting Mr. Anderson.

5. Kenosha County only has nine branches total, however, the case was passed around to **seven different judges** during the pendency of the case. The alleged victim had worked in the court system prior to his disappearance, and was, therefore, known by most circuit judges in the county. Because of the associated conflicts of interest, this became such a significant issue that at one point before trial, there was *no sitting judge* in Kenosha County who could hear Mr. Anderson's case. In the midst of a battle to have DA Graveley removed from prosecuting the case, it was reassigned to Hon. Judge Brach, before being passed off to yet another judge. This pattern of circumstances indicates "judge shopping," a highly disreputable practice, and begs the question - was the prosecution allowed to hand-pick the ultimate presiding judge? If so, was there improper intention in doing so?

6. Reliance on a **minor child as the star witness for the State**, who, at 12 years old, was deemed “highly susceptible to coercion” by one of the lead investigators.
7. DA Graveley and law enforcement repeatedly and intentionally **misrepresented the source of the only forensic evidence which could arguably connect Mr. Anderson to the alleged victim**—a miniscule speck of DNA found in the Defendant’s vehicle which could not be scientifically substantiated as belonging to any specific person, let alone the alleged victim.
8. **Improper investigation** by the Kenosha County Police, who honed in on Mr. Anderson from the very beginning of the case without looking into a number of other potential witnesses, leads, or theories.
9. Reliance on an **unreliable State informant**, whose testimony was challenged by another inmate at KCDC. This informant was promised a reduction in sentence by the State in exchange for his testimony.

Considering the insidious and egregious pattern of conduct outlined above, *we the people* request the following: an investigation into Mr. Zachariah Anderson’s case, an investigation into and the ultimate removal of DA Graveley from his position, and an investigation into the Kenosha County District Attorney’s Office for violations of the law and of criminal procedure.

/s/ _____