

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND RELEASED**

July 22, 1997

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See § 808.10 and RULE 809.62, STATS.

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

No. 97-0314-CR

STATE OF WISCONSIN

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT III**

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,

v.

PETER R. BAUMGARTEN,

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

APPEAL from a judgment of the circuit court for Marathon County:
VINCENT K. HOWARD, Judge. *Affirmed.*

LaROCQUE, J. Peter Baumgarten appeals a judgment of conviction for resisting a police officer in violation of § 946.4(1), STATS. His brief consists of a two-page argument that is essentially incomprehensible. He may be arguing that his arrest was unlawful because the officer failed to display the outstanding warrant for Baumgarten's arrest that caused the officer to stop him. This court affirms the judgment.

Baumgarten was arrested after a Village of Spencer police officer who knew him observed him driving a motor vehicle and confirmed that his driving privileges were suspended. The radio dispatcher also informed the arresting officer of an outstanding “body only” arrest warrant issued by the Marathon County Circuit Court directing that Baumgarten be arrested and brought before the court on a charge of obstructing an officer. Baumgarten refused to exit his vehicle and was arrested after a struggle.

Following a jury trial, sentence was stayed pending appeal. Baumgarten appears to argue that the officer’s failure to produce the arrest warrant “for inspection” is grounds to reverse the judgment of conviction. This court disagrees.

An arrest is reasonable where the arresting officer has information indicating an outstanding arrest warrant. *See White v. Olig*, 56 F.3d 817 (7th Cir. 1995). In this case, the dispatcher, who testified at trial and produced the warrant signed by a Marathon County judge, told the arresting officer that the sheriff’s department computer showed an outstanding arrest warrant for Baumgarten. She also testified that the entry included Baumgarten's name, date of birth, a physical description, the charge and date of the warrant and the name of the person who entered the information. This information provided sufficient probable cause to permit the arrest.

By the Court.—Judgment affirmed.

This opinion will not be published.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

