



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

January 18, 2018

To:

Hon. Nicholas McNamara
Circuit Court Judge, Br. 5
Dane County Courthouse
215 South Hamilton
Madison, WI 53703

Carlo Esqueda
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dane County Courthouse
215 S. Hamilton St., Rm. 1000
Madison, WI 53703

David R. Karpe
Karpe Law Office
448 W. Washington Ave.
Madison, WI 53703

Rachel Eleanor Sattler
Assistant District Attorney
215 S. Hamilton, Rm. 3000
Madison, WI 53703

Leonard R. Cardenas 534608
Racine Corr. Inst.
P.O. Box 900
Sturtevant, WI 53177-0900

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

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

2016AP1660-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Leonard R. Cardenas (L.C. # 2013CF175)
2016AP1661-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Leonard R. Cardenas (L.C. # 2014CF627)

Before Lundsten, P.J., Sherman and Kloppenburg, JJ.

Summary disposition orders may not be cited in any court of this state as precedent or authority, except for the limited purposes specified in WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(3).

Leonard Cardenas appeals judgments convicting him of substantial battery and felony bail jumping, both as repeaters. *See* WIS. STAT. §§ 940.19(2), 946.49(1)(b), 939.62(1)(b) (2015-

16).¹ Attorney David Karpe has filed a no-merit report seeking to withdraw as appellate counsel. WIS. STAT. RULE § 809.32; *see also Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). The no-merit report addresses the validity of the pleas and sentences. Cardenas was sent a copy of the report, and has not filed a response. Upon reviewing the entire record, as well as the no-merit report, we conclude that there are no arguably meritorious appellate issues. We summarily affirm the judgments of conviction. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

We agree with counsel that there is no arguable basis for Cardenas to withdraw his pleas. In order to withdraw a plea after sentencing, a defendant must either show that the plea colloquy was defective in a manner that resulted in the defendant actually entering an unknowing plea, or demonstrate some other manifest injustice such as coercion, the lack of a factual basis to support the charge, ineffective assistance of counsel, or failure by the prosecutor to fulfill the plea agreement. *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986); *State v. Krieger*, 163 Wis. 2d 241, 249-51 and n.6, 471 N.W.2d 599 (Ct. App. 1991). There is no indication of any such defect here.

Cardenas entered his pleas pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement that was presented in open court. In exchange for Cardenas's pleas of no contest, the State agreed to dismiss and read in other charges. The circuit court conducted a standard plea colloquy, inquiring into Cardenas's ability to understand the proceedings and the voluntariness of his plea decisions, and further exploring his understanding of the nature of the charges, the penalty ranges and other direct consequences of the pleas, and the constitutional rights being waived. *See State v. Hoppe*, 2009

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version unless otherwise noted.

WI 41, ¶18, 317 Wis. 2d 161, 765 N.W.2d 794; and *Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d at 266-72. The court made sure Cardenas understood that it would not be bound by any sentencing recommendations. In addition, Cardenas provided the court with signed plea questionnaires. Cardenas indicated to the court that he understood the information explained on those forms, and is not now claiming otherwise. See *State v. Moerderdorfer*, 141 Wis. 2d 823, 827-28, 416 N.W.2d 627 (Ct. App. 1987).

Cardenas confirmed on the record that there was a factual basis for the pleas. Nothing in the record or the no-merit report gives rise to an arguably meritorious challenge to the factual basis for Cardenas's pleas. There is likewise nothing in the record to suggest that counsel's performance was in any way deficient, and Cardenas has not alleged any other facts that would give rise to a manifest injustice. Therefore, his pleas were valid and operated to waive all nonjurisdictional defects and defenses, aside from any suppression ruling. *State v. Kelty*, 2006 WI 101, ¶18, 294 Wis. 2d 62, 716 N.W.2d 886.

A challenge to Cardenas's sentences would also lack arguable merit. Our review of a sentencing determination begins with a "presumption that the [circuit] court acted reasonably" and it is the defendant's burden to show "some unreasonable or unjustifiable basis in the record" in order to overturn it. *State v. Krueger*, 119 Wis. 2d 327, 336, 351 N.W.2d 738 (Ct. App. 1984). The record shows that Cardenas was afforded an opportunity to address the circuit court prior to sentencing. Cardenas confirmed on the record his status as a repeat offender. The court considered the standard sentencing factors and explained their application to this case. See generally *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶39-46, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197.

On the felony bail jumping count, a Class H felony under WIS. STAT. § 946.49(1)(b), the court imposed three years of initial confinement and one year of extended supervision. On the substantial battery count, a Class I felony under WIS. STAT. § 940.19(2), the court imposed three years of initial confinement and one year of extended supervision, consecutive to the other sentence and to any sentences Cardenas was then serving. The sentences imposed were consistent with the joint sentencing recommendation and were well within the penalty ranges permissible by law. *See* WIS. STAT. §§ 973.01(2)(b)8 and (d)5 (providing maximum terms of three years of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision for a Class H felony); 973.01(2)(b)9 and (d)6 (providing maximum terms of one and a half years of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision for a Class I felony) 939.62(1)(b) (increasing maximum term of imprisonment for offense otherwise punishable by one to ten years by four additional years for habitual criminality). Under these circumstances, it cannot reasonably be argued that Cardenas's sentences are so excessive as to shock public sentiment. *See Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

Upon our independent review of the record, we have found no other arguable basis for reversing the judgment of conviction. *See State v. Allen*, 2010 WI 89, ¶¶81-82, 328 Wis. 2d 1, 786 N.W.2d 124. We conclude that any further appellate proceedings would be wholly frivolous within the meaning of *Anders* and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgments of conviction are summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney David Karpe is relieved of any further representation of Leonard Cardenas in this matter pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE § 809.32(3).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

Diane M. Fremgen
Acting Clerk of Court of Appeals