

## 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 II

September 26, 2018

*To*:

Hon. Kent R. Hoffmann Circuit Court Judge 615 N. 6th Street Sheboygan, WI 53081

Melody Lorge Clerk of Circuit Court Sheboygan County Courthouse 615 N. 6th Street Sheboygan, WI 53081

Mark A. Schoenfeldt Law Firm of Mark Schoenfeldt 230 W. Wells Street, Ste. 706 Milwaukee, WI 53203 Joel Urmanski District Attorney 615 N. 6th Street Sheboygan, WI 53081

Alicia L. Clum 624877 Taycheedah Correctional Inst. P.O. Box 3100 Fond du Lac, WI 54936-3100

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:

2018AP1357-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Alicia L. Clum (L.C. #2014CF377)

Before Neubauer, C.J., Reilly, P.J., and Gundrum, J.

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).

Alicia L. Clum appeals from a judgment sentencing her after revocation of her probation for battery to an emergency rescue worker and misdemeanor bail jumping. Clum's appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to Wis. STAT. Rule 809.32 (2015-16)<sup>1</sup> and *Anders v*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2015-16 version.

*California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Clum received a copy of the report, was advised of her right to file a response, and has elected not to do so. After reviewing the record and counsel's report, we conclude that there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment. *See* Wis. Stat. Rule 809.21.

Clum was convicted following no contest pleas to battery to an emergency rescue worker and misdemeanor bail jumping. The circuit court withheld sentence and placed Clum on probation for three years. Her probation was later revoked, and she appeared before the court for sentencing after revocation. There, the court imposed an aggregate sentence of three years of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision. This no-merit appeal follows.

The no-merit report addresses whether the circuit court properly exercised its discretion in imposing its sentence after revocation. The circuit court's duty at sentencing after revocation is the same as its duty at the original sentencing. *State v. Wegner*, 2000 WI App 231, ¶7 n.1, 239 Wis. 2d 96, 619 N.W.2d 289.

Here, the record reveals that the circuit court's sentencing decision had a "rational and explainable basis." *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶76, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197 (citation omitted). The court considered the gravity of the offenses, Clum's character, and the need to protect the public. *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. The sentence imposed, which was within the statutory maximum, does not "shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper under the circumstances." *Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975). We agree with counsel that a challenge to Clum's sentence would lack arguable merit.

Our independent review of the record does not disclose any potentially meritorious issue for appeal.<sup>2</sup> Because we conclude that there would be no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal, we accept the no-merit report and relieve Attorney Mark A. Schoenfeldt of further representation in this matter.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Mark A. Schoenfeldt is relieved of further representation of Clum in this matter.

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

Sheila T. Reiff Clerk of Court of Appeals

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Any challenge to the underlying convictions is outside the scope of this appeal. *See State ex rel. Marth v. Smith*, 224 Wis. 2d 578, 582 n.5, 592 N.W.2d 307 (Ct. App. 1999). Review of probation revocation is by way of certiorari review to the court of conviction. *Id.* at 583.