Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

STATE OF WISCONSIN CLAIMS BOARD

On October 26, 2026, the State of Wisconsin Claims Board met in the State Capitol Building and via Zoom to consider the claims listed below.

Hearings were conducted on the following claims:

Claimant	Agency	Amount
1. Michael Seehafer	Corrections	$250,000.00
2. Richard Beranek	Innocent Convict Compensation	$500,000.00

The following claims were decided without a hearing:

3. Demetrius Cooper	Corrections	$50.00
4. Lance Richards	Corrections	$150,000.00
5. Darrell Rogers	Corrections	$207.85
6. Russell Rose	Corrections	$142.00
7. Michael Hart	Corrections	$2,085.25
8. Nathaniel Bacchus	University of Wisconsin	$15,750.97
9. Pittsburgh Technical, LLC	University of Wisconsin	$3,655,761.00

With respect to the above claims, the Board finds:
(Decisions are unanimous unless otherwise noted.)

1. Michael Seehafer of Weston, Wisconsin claims $250,000.00 for lost wages and other compensation for a six-month period (June 13, 2025, to December 15, 2025), during which he alleges he was incarcerated but should not have been. Seehafer contends that at a sentencing hearing in Marathon County in June 2022, he received 196 days of pre-sentence credit, although "all agencies" knew the credit should have been 491 days. (At hearing, it was clarified this was a sentencing hearing on revocation that occurred in June 2024.) Seehafer contends the error was not corrected until 2025. Seehafer provided a Notice of Release, showing he was released from custody on December 15, 2025, related to Langlade County Case Numbers 25-CF-24 and 25-CF-40. Seehafer also provided a Notification of Sentence Data, prepared on December 12, 2025, showing an adjusted release date/maximum discharge date of June 13, 2025, noting the following reason for change:

> "Received amended JOC for 19CF149 dated 12-8-2025 increasing credit from 194 days to 487 days after subsequent incarceration. Received amended JOC's for 21CF253 and 21CF723 dated 12-9-2025 increasing credit from 284 days to 487 days after subsequent incarceration. Received amended JOC for 22CF1002 dated 12-9-2025 increasing credit from 215 days to 491 days after subsequent incarceration. These increases in credit will be applied toward the ordered reconfinement period."

Seehafer also provided Discharge Certifications dated December 15, 2025, showing that judgments were satisfied on case numbers 19-CF-149, 21-CF-253, and 21-CF-723 effective June 13, 2025, and on case number 22-CF-1002 effective June 9, 2025. Seehafer contends the prolonged incarceration caused loss of freedom, medical issues, and pain and suffering. At hearing, Seehafer indicated that SSI has reimbursed him for more than six months of missed payments for the time he was incarcerated.

DOC recommends denial of this claim. DOC contends that Seehafer has not demonstrated any wrongdoing by DOC. DOC asserts it does not determine an individual's sentence and is not responsible for checking or confirming the information. DOC follows the Court's orders. DOC asserts Seehafer was released less than a week after the Court modified his sentences. While Seehafer contends "all agencies" knew what the credit should have been in June 2024, DOC maintains it was not at the sentencing hearing and was not a party to Seehafer's

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

cases. At hearing, DOC noted that it wrote to the court with a question related to sentence credit (although not the specific issue later identified) but was essentially told they are not a party. (This letter is noted on CCAP in case number 21-CF-253 on September 3, 2024.)

The Board defers its decision on this claim until a later date in order to obtain additional information from the parties.

2. Richard Beranek. The Board's decision on Richard Beranek's claim for innocent convict compensation will be issued in a separate decision.

3. Demetrius Cooper of Stanley, Wisconsin claims $50.00 for clothing items allegedly lost by DOC staff. Cooper notes that he was taken to the segregation unit at Stanley Correctional Institution on December 24, 2025. Cooper indicates that inmates taken to segregation are not allowed to pack their own property; property is packed by DOC staff. On December 26, 2025, Cooper received a property inventory form. Missing on the form were two t-shirts and a thermal top, all purchased on April 18, 2018. Cooper alleges he was advised by staff to write to the officer who packed his property and to the laundry department. While in segregation, Cooper was unable to physically sort through his property to confirm whether the three clothing items were in fact missing or review his paperwork to show proof of possession. Cooper contends he was released from segregation around January 24, 2026, when he and the property officer sorted through his clothing and confirmed the three items were missing. Cooper claims he immediately submitted a complaint via the Inmate Complaint Review System (ICRS), which was rejected as untimely. Cooper contends he followed staff directives to contact the officer who packed his property and the laundry department, and that he filed the ICRS complaint as soon as he confirmed the items were missing and had the receipts. Cooper further contends that the fact that he signed the property form presented to him while in segregation, was not an acknowledgement that the information on the form was correct. Cooper asserts his ICRS complaint should have been investigated. Cooper seeks reimbursement for two t-shirts, one thermal top, and costs for mailing and copying.

DOC recommends this claim be denied. First, DOC points to the fact that Cooper failed to exhaust his administrative remedies by not timely filing his ICRS complaint. DOC notes that when an inmate is placed in segregation, staff secure the inmate's property, inventory the property on a DOC-236 form, document the condition of any electronics, provide a copy of the inventoried items to the inmate to review and sign, and that the inmate shall inform staff if they believe items are missing. DOC asserts that Cooper was presented with the DOC-236 on December 26, 2025. He signed the form and, according to DOC, acknowledged that it was correct. DOC asserts this "acknowledgement" is that an inventory was completed on Cooper's property and it included a certain number of shirts. If the number of shirts on the inventory was different than what he recalled possessing, he was then on notice of potential missing items and the two-week period in which to submit an ICRS complaint starts. He did not file his ICRS complaint until January 26, 2026. DOC denies that Cooper was told by staff to wait to file an ICRS complaint. ICRS complaints are time sensitive so that appropriate investigations and records can be made. DOC further notes that pursuant to DOC's depreciation schedule, clothing has a useful life of 5 years. Under those guidelines, Cooper would not be awarded anything for clothing purchased in April 2018.

The Board notes that because Cooper failed to timely file an ICRS complaint, there was no investigation into this matter. An investigation record may have helped the Board evaluate this claim. The Board concludes there has been an insufficient showing of negligence on the part of the state, its officers, agents, or employees and this claim is neither one for which the state is legally liable nor one which the state should assume and pay based on equitable principles.

4. Lance Richards of Eagle, Wisconsin claims $150,000.00 for lost wages and other compensation for a period of 994 days, during which time he alleges he was on extended supervision (ES) beyond his correct discharge date. Richards contends that DOC was negligent and miscalculated his ES term. Richards notes he was sentenced in Waukesha County

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

Case Number 01-CF-775 on January 25, 2002, for an incident that occurred on August 14, 2001, making 1999-2000 statutes applicable. He was sentenced to 7 years confinement plus 10 years ES (bifurcated, TIS-I rules). Richards asserts he was released to ES on February 18, 2022, with 1 year, 1 month, 29 days (423 days total) remaining. He maintains his correct maximum discharge was April 17, 2023 (10 years fixed ES, net community time served). His actual discharge occurred on January 6, 2026 – 994 days late.

Richards argues that under Wis. Stat. § 302.113(9)(c) (1999-2000), ES expires at the end of the imposed term and there are no extensions from re-confinement. Richards further argues that *State ex rel. Kawleski v State*, 2025 WI App 45, confirms DOC cannot augment ES beyond the original sentence. Richards alleges that DOC applied TIS-II math (total sentence minus all confinement), ignoring prior ES credit.

Richards maintains that his claim rests on equitable principles. Richards contends the prolonged supervision caused him loss of freedom, restricted life, reporting burdens, emotional distress, and anxiety. Although Richards' initial claim sought $150,000.00, in his final reply he modifies the amount of his claim to "$150,000, or at a minimum $32,000 to cover [his] documented financial losses, or such an amount the Board finds just and equitable." (*See* Claimant's Final Reply, Page 1.)

DOC recommends this claim be denied. DOC maintains it calculated Richards' ES term correctly, and according to existing law at the time of calculation. DOC explains that in 1999, the Legislature enacted "Truth in Sentencing" or "TIS". This established a sentencing scheme where a sentence for a criminal conviction would have two parts: incarceration and a period of ES. This constituted a "bifurcated sentence." While an individual is on ES, they could be re-incarcerated for rule violations, however, the total amount of incarceration cannot exceed the total in the original bifurcated sentence. DOC notes that saying the total incarceration time cannot exceed the original bifurcated sentence does not mean the total incarceration plus ES cannot exceed the bifurcated sentence. DOC asserts that Wis. Stat. § 302.113(9)(c) (1999), is clear and unequivocally states that following re-incarceration, the ES is determined by taking the total time of the bifurcated sentence and subtracting the periods of incarceration. It does not say that prior periods of ES are also subtracted. Consequently, the period of ES re-sets. It may be longer than the original period, or it may be shorter.

DOC contends it followed the statute as written; it did not have discretion to construe the statute to give credit for prior time served on ES. The courts, however, do have that discretion. In *State ex rel. Kawleski v. State*, 2025 WI App 45, 417 Wis. 2d 691, 25 N.W.3d 598, the court construed this statute to mean that an individual should also be given credit for prior time served on ES. That decision stated that it only applied to the statute from December 31,1999, through February 2003 (that being the date the statute was amended to correct initial discrepancies.) These two versions of the statute have become known as TIS I and TIS II. Richards' case falls within that time period, and therefore, when *Kawleski* was decided, his ES was re-calculated to comply with that decision. DOC contends it was not negligent; it calculated Richards' ES at all times according to the law as it existed at that time. DOC further contends that Richards has shown no damages or negligence on the part of DOC.

The Board concludes there has been an insufficient showing of negligence on the part of the state, its officers, agents, or employees and this claim is neither one for which the state is legally liable nor one which the state should assume and pay based on equitable principles.

5. **Darrell Rogers** of Sturtevant, Wisconsin claims $207.85 for 17 publications allegedly sent out of Waupun Correctional Institution by DOC staff incorrectly. Rogers alleges that on June 25, 2020, he received a property receipt/disposition indicating, among other things, that 17 publications were being deemed contraband because they were not labeled with his name or DOC number. Rogers asserts he requested that staff send out the over-limit property referenced on the form (*i.e.*, a calendar, address book, photos, notebooks, hair combs, and carbon paper). Rogers indicates he was informed around July 14, 2020, that the publications had been sent out by CO Levey. Rogers asserts it was negligent performance of staff duties that his publications were sent out with the over-limit property. Rogers filed a complaint via the Inmate Complaint Review System (ICRS). The complaint was affirmed, "for statistical purposes that the contraband publications were wrongly sent out but there is no remedial action that can be done. Inmate is

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

reminded that all publications are to have his name and number in them per policy that way they will not be contraband." (*See* Complaint Number WCI-2020-12725, ICE Recommendation, July 29, 2020.) Rogers contends that property receipts prove he was the owner of the publications. He seeks reimbursement for the items no longer in his possession due to actions of staff.

DOC recommends denial of this claim. DOC asserts the publications were properly confiscated as contraband because they were not labeled with his name or DOC number as required by policy. DOC contends that when Rogers wrote to staff requesting the over-limit property be sent out of the institution, staff misunderstood what Rogers wanted and sent all the property to his family member. DOC notes that Rogers did not contest the contraband determination; his ICRS complaint related only to the items being sent out. DOC asserts that inmates generally have three options for contraband property – donate to the institution, send out to a designated person, or have the property destroyed. DOC contends that because the property was sent out, the items can be recovered upon Rogers' release; he has suffered no economic loss.

The Board concludes there has been an insufficient showing of negligence on the part of the state, its officers, agents, or employees and this claim is neither one for which the state is legally liable nor one which the state should assume and pay based on equitable principles.

6. **Russell Rose** of Waupun, Wisconsin claims $142.00 for books allegedly disposed of by DOC staff. Rose notes that on July 12, 2025, he was housed at Waupun Correctional Institution, restrictive housing unit cell number C118. Rose contends that staff removed him from his cell for a rule infraction. Rose alleges that CO Copeland entered his cell and "intentionally destroyed" six books, valued at $142.00. On a later date, Rose claims he reviewed his property inventory and the six books were missing. Rose alleges that on August 20, 2025, CO Copeland admitted to disposing Rose's property. Rose filed a complaint via the Inmate Complaint Review System, which was affirmed in part and he was awarded $85.00. Rose seeks full reimbursement for the books.

DOC recommends denial of this claim. DOC contends that Rose was removed from his cell due to a medical incident. The six books were disposed of because Rose vomited on them and they posed a health risk. DOC notes that Rose was reimbursed the depreciated value of each book. During the ICRS investigation, the Institution Complaint Examiner noted that although the books were properly disposed of pursuant to DAI 309.20.03 and facility procedure because they posed a health or safety risk, staff should have completed the proper documentation regarding the disposal of the books. DOC further contends that the medical incident Rose faced was a result of his own actions, for which he received a conduct report. DOC contends that Rose has been properly reimbursed for his books.

The Board concludes there has been an insufficient showing of negligence on the part of the state, its officers, agents, or employees and this claim is neither one for which the state is legally liable nor one which the state should assume and pay based on equitable principles.

7. **Michael Hart** of Oshkosh, Wisconsin claims $2,085.25 for a Score 7 tablet and contents allegedly lost by DOC staff. Hart indicates that on August 31, 2021, he purchased a tablet for $142.80. Over time, he alleges to have purchased 951 songs at $1.95 each ($1,854.45 total), and 37 games at $3-4 each ($88.00 total). Hart contends that on December 23, 2025, his tablet was taken by DOC staff during a search of another inmate's cell, who was fixing the tablet for Hart. Hart maintains that DOC policy does not allow inmates to send out their tablets for repair. Hart explains that staff advised the tablet could not be returned to him because the screws had been removed. Hart notes a property disposition form was completed to have the tablet destroyed and removed from his property. Hart filed a complaint via the Inmate Complaint Review System (ICRS). During that investigation, documentation revealed the tablet was recovered from the other inmate's cell as contraband – altered and no DOC number – and staff had the tablet destroyed. Hart maintains that per DOC policy, an item believed to be contraband should be confiscated and identified with a contraband property tag. The item should be logged and stored for a period of time to allow for any potential disciplinary proceedings. Hart contends the

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

investigation revealed the tablet was lost while under staff control. The ICRS complaint was affirmed and Hart was reimbursed a depreciated value of $13.00. Hart contends he should be reimbursed the full amount paid for the tablet and contents.

DOC recommends denial of this claim. DOC first notes that the Score 7 tablets are obsolete and being phased out. DOC explains that inmates can access the digital contents for the time being, so long as the devices are functional. Once non-functional, the devices are not being repaired or replaced, at which time the digital content becomes non-accessible. DOC acknowledges that Hart's ICRS complaint was affirmed and that he was awarded $13.00. DOC contends the decision was based on a technicality in that staff did not follow procedure when the tablet was destroyed. DOC further contends that Hart bears some responsibility for the missing tablet as he engaged the other inmate to perform repairs and allowed that inmate to possess his property. DOC maintains that inmates are not allowed to repair electronics themselves, and that the tablets have limited functionality for safety and security reasons. Repairs are limited to certain circumstances to prevent alteration and unintended use. DOC asserts Hart has already been properly reimbursed related to this claim.

The Board concludes there has been an insufficient showing of negligence on the part of the state, its officers, agents, or employees and this claim is neither one for which the state is legally liable nor one which the state should assume and pay based on equitable principles.

8. Nathaniel Bacchus of Madison, Wisconsin claims $15,750.97 for damages for an alleged breach of an employment contract with the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Bacchus indicates he was hired by UW-Madison, School of Medicine and Public Health, Department of Population Services on September 6, 2023, as a Research Specialist (Phlebotomist) under a 100% fixed-term appointment with an end date of September 5, 2025. Bacchus contends his salary was approximately $58,000 and that the written offer/appointment letter constitutes an employment contract for the stated term. Bacchus asserts that under UW's Academic Staff Policies and Procedures, a fixed-term appointment confers the right to serve the full term unless not renewed at the end of term or dismissed mid-term for just cause. Bacchus alleges that UW terminated him on May 12, 2025, citing "unsatisfactory performance." Bacchus contends this was a material breach of the employment contract because it violated applicable procedural requirements. Specifically, there was no prior written warning of performance deficiencies, investigation, pre-termination meeting, notice of appeal rights, progressive discipline, or egregious conduct. Bacchus asserts that UW acknowledged the deficient May 12th termination when it was rescinded on May 20, 2025, and Bacchus was placed on paid administrative leave. Bacchus maintains this did not cure the breach; the contract entitled him to active employment through September 5, 2025. Bacchus received a second termination letter on June 6, 2025, citing policy violations. Bacchus contends the alleged performance issues, if legitimate, are irrelevant to this claim. Bacchus maintains the question here is whether UW followed the required procedures before terminating him mid-contract. Bacchus contends he is owned the wages and benefits he would have earned through the end of his appointment.

UW recommends denial of this claim. First, UW notes that at the time of its response to this claim (May 2026), Bacchus has a pending employment discrimination claim with the Equal Rights Division (ERD) related to this termination. UW alleges that in the ERD matter (filed in August 2025), Bacchus initially claimed race discrimination and later amended his complaint to include discrimination based on sex. UW maintains the position that to the extent Bacchus argues he had a two-year employment contract, he breached the contract by failing to perform the duties required of the position. Further, due to the pending ERD matter and Bacchus's other pending lawsuits in Dane County against UW employees regarding his employment, UW recommends denial of this claim. Potential damages available in those actions could include wages as sought here.

The Board concludes that this claim raises questions of fact that are better evaluated by a court of law. Therefore, the Board denies payment of this claim. *[Chair Sutherlin did not participate.]*

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

9. Pittsburgh Technical, LLC of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania claims $3,655,761.00 for damages for alleged misrepresentations, professional negligence/engineering malpractice, breach of contract, and restitution, arising from a formal research agreement with UW-Madison. Pittsburgh Technical LLC is a company specializing in nuclear safety engineering. In connection with a project for GE Vernova Hitachi Nuclear Energy (GE), Pittsburgh Technical engaged UW to perform specialized nuclear severe-accident modeling using the MELCOR code. On September 24, 2025, Pittsburgh Technical and UW executed a written Research Agreement (UWRAMP# AGR00010143) with a defined performance period of June 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, and a fixed price of $32,000. Pittsburgh Technical notes that the Agreement identified Dr. Woo Hyun Jung as the project's Principal Investigator (PI), responsible for designing the research, directing experiments and analysis, ensuring scientific integrity, selecting and supervising the research team, managing the budget, and ensuring that the project complies with university policies, etc. The Agreement describes safety-significant modeling work including performance of both Large-Break Loss of Coolant Accident (LLOCA) and Medium/Small-Break Loss of Coolant Accident (MLOCA/SLOCA) analyses, among other deliverables. The modeling work was to be directly incorporated into Pittsburgh Technical's deliverables to GE for nuclear licensing support purposes.

First, Pittsburgh Technical alleges that UW and Dr. Jung made material misrepresentations in connection with the Agreement. Specifically, it is alleged that UW knowingly or recklessly made material misrepresentations regarding Dr. Jung's qualifications, title, PI eligibility, and capability to perform the contract work, upon which Pittsburgh Technical relied. In addition, UW allegedly supplied false and misleading information regarding model configuration, correctness of critical parameters, and activation of required features without exercising reasonable care. (*See* Claimant's Claim Addendum, Page 3, 4.)

Pittsburgh Technical also alleges a pattern of defective performance. Throughout the performance period, Pittsburgh Technical asserts that Dr. Jung repeatedly produced MELCOR model iterations that contained significant and recurring errors. GE engineers identified and rejected defective work product on multiple occasions. Pittsburgh Technical contends that Dr. Jung admitted numerous errors and failed to correct them within the agreed scope and schedule. (*See* Claimant's Claim Addendum, Page 3.)

Pittsburgh Technical further alleges that when it demanded Dr. Jung correct known errors, UW and Dr. Jung refused to perform any further simulations or corrections unless Pittsburgh Technical agreed to a contract amendment increasing the total price from $32,000 to $127,000. Pittsburgh Technical contends that UW did not provide adequate justification for the increase and halted work despite critical project deadlines and GE actively rejecting deliverables. (*See* Claimant's Claim Addendum, Page 3-4.)

Pittsburgh Technical claims that on October 18, 2025, Dr. Juliana Pacheco Duarte (affiliated with UW) sent an e-mail to GE stating that UW would no longer work with Pittsburgh Technical due to its conduct. Pittsburgh Technical contends it did not implicate any issue of research integrity or ethics. Pittsburgh Technical contends that in this field, such allegations have regulatory significance and can trigger Nuclear Regulatory Commission Problem Identification and Resolution processes under 10 C.F.R. Part 50 Appendix B, requiring formal documentation, evaluation, and corrective actions. On October 19, 2025, Pittsburgh Technical notified UW leadership of the e-mail to GE and demanded retraction to no avail. (*See* Claimant's Claim Addendum, Page 4.)

Pittsburgh Technical further claims that on February 9, 2026, GE rejected Pittsburgh Technical's invoice of $497,161.00, stating that the work delivered was insufficient, did not meet the agreed scope, and that GE had been required to deploy internal engineering resources to complete outstanding and corrective activities. GE also allegedly declined to continue using Pittsburgh Technical for subsequent phases of the project, worth approximately $3,000,000.

Pittsburgh Technical maintains that regardless of any other pending matter, this claim is based on whether equitable principles and the contractual obligations of the State warrant a recommendation for payment under Wis. Stat. § 16.007.

UW recommends denial of this claim. UW contends that Dr. Talabi, President of Pittsburgh Technical, contacted Dr. Jung directly on March 1, 2025, regarding a potential consulting opportunity related to a Level I PRA and MELCOR analysis. Dr. Jung reportedly began the consulting work in June 2025, before a written agreement was in place. The parties

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

exchanged draft agreements before executing the Research Agreement on September 24, 2025. The Agreement designated Dr. Jung as the PI. UW notes the stated goal in the Agreement was to "perform the accident analysis for GE-Hitachi's BWRX-300 reactor design using MELCOR code, especially focusing on the aerosol deposition behavior within a containment vessel and through the containment wall crack towards the reactor building." The Statement of Work set forth two performance objectives: (1) development of a MELCOR input deck, and (2) a "Safety analysis for LLOCA/MLOCA." Project costs were based on approximately two months of Dr. Jung's time.

UW contends that the notion that the modeling work was to be directly incorporated into Pittsburgh Technical's deliverables to GE for nuclear licensing-support purposes was not communicated to UW at the time of contracting. UW notes the Agreement was not structured as a subcontract to Pittsburgh Technical's contract with GE, and it did not require performance of a licensing-related safety analysis. UW further notes that the Agreement expressly states that, "University makes no expressed or implied warranties for results of the Research Project."

UW asserts that Dr. Jung completed the first objective of the Statement of Work by developing the MELCOR input deck. After the initial accident analysis reportedly did not produce the results Pittsburgh Technical sought, multiple revisions were requested, some after the Agreement's performance period ended. UW alleges that revisions exceeded requirements of the Agreement.

UW maintains that Dr. Jung also completed the safety analysis for LLOCA under the second objective, and on September 26, 2025, Pittsburgh Technical excused UW from performing the MLOCA component, indicating that any additional work would be included in a separate contract. Pittsburgh Technical also excused UW from preparing a final report. UW contends that Dr. Jung still collaborated with the Pittsburgh Technical team on a report that was transmitted to GE on September 29, 2025, with a revised version sent on October 16, 2025, incorporating the results of the safety analysis for LLOCA, satisfying objectives 3 and 4 of the statement of work.

Despite completion of the contracted work, UW alleges that Dr. Talabi continued to request simulations outside the scope of the Agreement to respond to GE's requests. On October 9, 2025, UW provided a proposed budget of $95,000 for further work.

According to UW, on October 17, 2025, GE requested an update to the model's break flow location. Dr. Talabi advised Dr. Jung and Dr. Duarte that they needed to fix the model and re-run it immediately. On October 17, 2025, Dr. Duarte informed Dr. Talabi that the contract had ended, and no additional work would be performed without an amendment. As communications continued to break down between the parties, on October 18, 2025, Dr. Duarte emailed Dr. Talabi and copied employees of GE stating that the contract between Pittsburgh Technical and UW had concluded on October 1, 2025.

UW contends that Pittsburgh Technical has not paid any portion of the $32,000 owed under the Agreement. UW issued its initial invoice on October 20, 2025, with follow-ups sent thereafter. The full balance remains outstanding. (*See* UW's Appendix 1.)

At the time of UW's final response (June 2026), UW notes there was pending litigation against Dr. Jung and Dr. Duarte arising from the same facts in this claim. UW contends that much of Pittsburgh Technical's requested relief falls outside the scope of Wis. Stat. § 16.007. UW maintains there is an underdeveloped factual record and the claimed damages are unsupported. UW requests the claim be denied in full.

The Board concludes that this claim raises questions of fact that are better evaluated by a court of law. Therefore, the Board denies payment of this claim. *[Chair Sutherlin did not participate.]*

Docusign Envelope ID: AEC62655-CA35-8E32-8128-01621103D3D2

The Board concludes:

That payment of the amount below to the identified claimant(s) from the following statutory appropriation is justified under Wis. Stat. § 16.007(6)(b).:

None

That the following claims are denied:

Demetrius Cooper
Lance Richards
Darrell Rogers
Russell Rose
Michael Hart
Nathaniel Bacchus
Pittsburgh Technical, LLC

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin this 13th **day of November, 2026.**

Signed by:
Lara Sutherlin
04591EE675FC4D2...
Lara Sutherlin, Board Chair
Wisconsin Dept. of Justice

Signed by:
Jennifer Vandermeuse
5AFF406F8DDF41B...
Jennifer Vandermeuse, Board Secretary
Wisconsin Dept. of Administration

Signed by:
Eric Wimberger
B3662727B1D545C...
Eric Wimberger
Senate Finance Committee

Signed by:
542FC46E5D0B459...
Alex Dallman
Assembly Finance Committee

Signed by:
Mel Barnes
DF46870179E3436...
Mel Barnes
Office of the Governor