

No. 96-0736

STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT II

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

ERRATA SHEET

BERNARD B. KRIER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Marilyn L. Graves
Clerk of Court of Appeals
231 East, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Peg Carlson
Chief Staff Attorney
119 Martin Luther King Blvd.
Madison, WI 53703

Court of Appeals-District I
633 West Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53203

Court of Appeals-District II
2727 N. Grandview Blvd.
Waukesha, WI 53188-1672

Court of Appeals-District III
740 Third Street
Wausau, WI 54401-6292

Court of Appeals-District IV
119 Martin Luther King Blvd.
Madison, WI 53703

Jennifer Krapf
Administrative Assistant
119 Martin Luther King Blvd.
Madison, WI 53703

Hon. Thomas R. Wolfgram
Ozaukee County Courthouse
1201 South Spring Street
Port Washington, WI 53074-0994

Sandy A. Williams
District Attorney
P.O. Box 994
Port Washington, WI 53074-0994

Christopher A. Mutschler
N9661 Willow Road
Elkhart Lake, WI 53030

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the attached pages 2 and 3 are to be substituted for pages 2 and 3 in the above-captioned opinion which was released on September 4, 1996.

Dated this 12th day of December, 2006.

separate notices of intent to revoke operating privileges. Krier requested refusal hearings, which were consolidated and held on February 26, 1996.

At the hearing, the trial court revoked Krier's driving privileges, two years for the first refusal and three years for the second refusal, after it found that his refusals to submit to a breathalyzer test were unreasonable. See § 343.305 (9), (10), STATS. Krier now renews his argument that the Informing the Accused Form that was read to him was defective.

Krier focuses on how the form did not reveal that any possible sanction would require proof that he had been "driving or operating a motor vehicle." See § 343.305(4)(c), STATS. Nonetheless, we need not address Krier's specific theory because we find that the supreme court's decision in *Village of Oregon v. Bryant*, 188 Wis.2d 680, 524 N.W.2d 635 (1994), forecloses any claim that the form is defective. There the court held that the form provides "sufficient information" to the accused driver. *Id.* at 694, 524 N.W.2d at 640.

Prior to the *Bryant* decision, this court has consistently held that the Informing the Accused Form must be assessed against its substantial compliance with the reasonable objectives of the statute. See *State v. Sutton*, 177 Wis.2d 709, 715, 503 N.W.2d 326, 328 (Ct. App. 1993); *State v. Riley*, 172 Wis.2d 452, 457-58, 493 N.W.2d 401, 403 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Piskula*, 168 Wis.2d 135, 140-41, 483 N.W.2d 250, 252 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Muenta*, 159 Wis.2d 279, 280-81, 464 N.W.2d 230, 231 (Ct. App. 1990). The form used by the arresting officer fully advised Krier of his rights and the potential consequences of his refusal to submit to a requested chemical test. Krier does not dispute that.

The omission of the words “driving or operating a motor vehicle” does not affect Krier being properly advised of his rights and penalties as recited in the form.

The trial court's order finding that Krier's refusal to submit to the requested chemical test was unreasonable is therefore affirmed.

By the Court. – Order affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. *See* RULE 809.23(1)(b)4, STATS.