



OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688
Telephone (608) 266-1880
TTY: (800) 947-3529
Facsimile (608) 267-0640
Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

DISTRICT IV

April 4, 2017

To:

Hon. John R. Storck
Circuit Court Judge
Justice Facility
210 West Center St.
Juneau, WI 53039

Lynn M. Hron
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dodge Co. Justice Facility
210 West Center Street
Juneau, WI 53039

Robert G. Barrington
Dodge Co. District Attorney's Office
210 W. Center Street
Juneau, WI 53039-1086

Charlotte Gibson
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

Criminal Appeals Unit
Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857

Trent A. Rebstock
703 Horicon St., Apt. 10
Horicon, WI 53032

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following opinion and order:

2016AP1813-CR State of Wisconsin v. Trent A. Rebstock (L.C. # 2013CM348)

Before Lundsten, J.

Trent Rebstock appeals pro se from the circuit court's order denying his motion to reopen his commitment upon a plea of not guilty by reason of mental disease or defect to a charge of obstructing an officer.¹ For the reasons that follow, I affirm.

¹ This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(f). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version.

The record indicates that, in August 2015, the circuit court issued a discharge order showing that Rebstock's commitment was to expire in October 2015. Thus, so far as this court can tell, Rebstock is no longer subject to commitment, at least not as a result of the case at hand.

Rebstock's short appellate brief lacks coherence. There are no citations to legal authority, and most of the record cites do not make sense. The brief fails to explain clearly what relief Rebstock seeks or what justifies any relief at all. Best I can tell, Rebstock's assertions largely fall into three main categories, each of which I address below. Even putting aside any procedural bars, none of Rebstock's assertions provide a basis on which I could reverse the circuit court.

First, Rebstock appears to challenge the terms of his commitment. For example, Rebstock asserts, without legal support, that "I should not have had to do the court's conditional release program." Such assertions, without more, plainly do not provide any basis for the circuit court to reopen Rebstock's case at this point in time.

Second, Rebstock appears to seek expungement or the destruction of records relating to his commitment. However, Rebstock falls far short of demonstrating that there is any reason why he might be entitled to expungement or the destruction of any records.

Third, as part of what Rebstock labels a "Side Argument," Rebstock makes several allegations against his trial counsel, who Rebstock indicates was an assistant state public defender. These allegations fall along a spectrum from the wholly innocuous ("She's government") to the potentially serious ("She gave me false information"). However, even as to the most serious of Rebstock's allegations, they are not sufficiently specific or explained to warrant relief. See *State v. Allen*, 2004 WI 106, ¶¶12-24, 274 Wis. 2d 568, 682 N.W.2d 433

(discussing the level of specificity needed when alleging postconviction or post-disposition claims such as ineffective assistance of counsel).

In sum, for the reasons above, I affirm the circuit court's order denying Rebstock's motion to reopen his commitment.

IT IS ORDERED that the order is summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Court of Appeals