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 I

September 7, 2018

To:

Hon. M. Joseph Donald
Circuit Court Judge
Felony Division
821 W. State St., Rm. 506
Milwaukee, WI 53233

John Barrett
Clerk of Circuit Court
821 W. State Street, Room 114
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Karen A. Loebel
Asst. District Attorney
821 W. State St.
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Mark S. Rosen
Rosen and Holzman
400 W. Moreland Blvd. Ste. C
Waukesha, WI 53188

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

Shiane Holmes 653647
Taycheedah Corr. Inst.
P.O. Box 3100
Fond du Lac, WI 54936-3100

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

2018AP241-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Shiane Holmes (L.C. # 2016CF4597)

Before Kessler, P.J., Brennan and Dugan, 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).

Shiane Holmes appeals a judgment convicting her of one count of hit and run, involving a death, and one count of knowingly operating a vehicle without a valid driver's license, causing death. Appointed appellate counsel, Mark S. Rosen, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS.

STAT. RULE 809.32 (2015-16),[1] and ***Anders v. California***, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Holmes received a copy of the report and was advised of her right to file a response, but she has not responded. After considering the report and conducting an independent review of the record, we conclude that there are no arguably meritorious issues that could be raised on appeal.

The no-merit report first addresses whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that Holmes's guilty plea was not knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered. The circuit court conducted a colloquy that conformed to the strictures of WIS. STAT. § 971.08 and ***State v. Bangert***, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 266-72, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986), when read in conjunction with Holmes's signed plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form. *See* ***State v. Moederndorfer***, 141 Wis. 2d 823, 827-28, 416 N.W.2d 627 (Ct. App. 1987) (the court may rely on a plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form in assessing the defendant's knowledge about the rights he or she is waiving by entering a plea). There would be no arguable merit to an appellate challenge to the plea.

The no-merit report next addresses whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court misused its sentencing discretion when it imposed a total of ten years of initial confinement and six years of extended supervision for the two convictions. The record establishes that the circuit court carefully considered and applied the appropriate sentencing factors, addressing both aggravating and mitigating circumstances. *See* ***State v. Ziegler***, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76 (the court must identify the factors it

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

considered and explain how those factors influenced its sentencing decision). There would be no arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court misused its sentencing discretion.

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of conviction and relieve Attorney Rosen of further representation of Holmes.[2]

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of conviction is summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Mark S. Rosen is relieved from further representing Shiane Holmes in this appeal. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32(3).

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

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Court of Appeals

[2] Two mandatory DNA surcharges were assessed on the judgments of conviction. We previously put these appeals on hold pending the Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision in ***State v. Odom***, No. 2015AP2525-CR, which was expected to address whether a defendant could withdraw a plea because the defendant was not advised at the time of the plea that multiple mandatory DNA surcharges would be assessed. The ***Odom*** appeal was voluntarily dismissed before oral argument. These cases were then held for a decision in ***State v. Freiboth***, 2018 WI App ___, __ Wis. 2d __, __ N.W.2d __ (2015AP2535). ***Freiboth*** holds that a plea hearing court does not have a duty to inform the defendant about the mandatory DNA surcharge because the surcharge is not punishment and is not a direct consequence of the plea. ***Id.***, ¶12. Consequently, there is no arguable merit to a claim for plea withdrawal based on the assessment of mandatory DNA surcharges.