



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

October 31, 2018

To:

Hon. Phillip A. Koss
Circuit Court Judge
P.O. Box 1001
Elkhorn, WI 53121

Kristina Secord
Clerk of Circuit Court
Walworth County Courthouse
P.O. Box 1001
Elkhorn, WI 53121-1001

Zeke Wiedenfeld
District Attorney
P.O. Box 1001
Elkhorn, WI 53121

Vicki Zick
Zick Legal LLC
P.O. Box 325
Johnson Creek, WI 53038

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

Christopher L. Mangold
3 Scarlet Ct. Lake St.
Lake Saint Louis, MO 63367

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

2018AP359-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Christopher L. Mangold (L.C. #2014CF137)
2018AP360-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Christopher L. Mangold (L.C. #2014CF182)
2018AP361-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Christopher L. Mangold (L.C. #2014CF289)
2018AP362-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Christopher L. Mangold (L.C. #2017CT113)
2018AP363-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Christopher L. Mangold (L.C. #2017CT114)

Before Neubauer, C.J., Reilly, P.J., and Hagedorn, 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).

In these consolidated cases, Christopher L. Mangold appeals from judgments convicting him of various crimes. Mangold's appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to Wis.

STAT. RULE 809.32 (2015-16)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Mangold received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and has elected not to do so. After reviewing the records and counsel's report, we conclude that there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgments. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Mangold was convicted following guilty pleas to second-degree recklessly endangering safety, contempt as a punitive sanction, bail jumping, operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated (OWI) as a second offense, and OWI as a third offense. The charges stemmed from a series of alcohol-related incidents that were resolved together in the circuit court. The court imposed and stayed an aggregate sentence of seven and one-half years of initial confinement and six and one-half years of extended supervision. It also ordered six years of probation, 320 days in jail, and fines for the OWI convictions. This no-merit appeal follows.

The no-merit report addresses whether Mangold's guilty pleas were knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. The records show that the circuit court engaged in a colloquy with Mangold that satisfied the applicable requirements of WIS. STAT. § 971.08(1) and *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. In addition, signed plea questionnaire and waiver of rights forms were entered into the records, along with relevant jury instructions detailing the elements of the offenses. We agree with counsel that a challenge to the entry of Mangold's guilty pleas would lack arguable merit.

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

The no-merit report also addresses whether the circuit court properly exercised its discretion at sentencing. The records reveal that the 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 seriousness of the offenses, Mangold’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. Under the circumstances of the cases, which were aggravated by Mangold’s absconson from the state while the matters were pending, the sentencing decision does not “shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper.” *Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975). We agree with counsel that a challenge to the court’s sentencing decision would lack arguable merit.

Finally, the no-merit report addresses whether Mangold was afforded effective assistance of trial counsel. There is nothing in the records to suggest that Mangold received ineffective assistance. Indeed, at the plea hearing, Mangold indicated that he was satisfied with how counsel handled the cases. Consequently, we are satisfied that the no-merit report properly analyzes this issue as without merit, and we will not discuss it further.

Our independent review of the records does not disclose any potentially meritorious issue for appeal. 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 Vicki Zick of further representation in these matters.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Vicki Zick is relieved of further representation of Mangold in these matters.

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

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Court of Appeals