

## 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 14, 2019

*To*:

Hon. John M. Wood Circuit Court Judge Circuit Court Branch 6 51 S. Main St. Janesville, WI 53545

Jacki Gackstatter Clerk of Circuit Court Rock County Courthouse 51 S. Main St. Janesville, WI 53545

Gerald A. Urbik Assistant District Attorney 51 S. Main St. Janesville, WI 53545 Jacob J. Wittwer Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 7857 Madison, WI 53707-7857

Lawrence V. Pinkerton 528279 Oshkosh Correctional Inst. P.O. Box 3310 Oshkosh, WI 54903-3310

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

2017AP2447-CR

State of Wisconsin v. Lawrence V. Pinkerton (L.C. # 2013CF2651)

Before Lundsten, P.J., Blanchard 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).

Lawrence Pinkerton, pro se, appeals the circuit court's order denying his request for sentence credit. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1). We affirm.

Pinkerton asserts the following facts. Pinkerton was on probation in a prior case. On October 24, 2013, he was arrested, jailed, and placed on a probation hold. His probation was revoked and he received a revocation sentence on or around March 15 or 16, 2014. He was transferred to prison on March 28, 2014, to serve out his revocation sentence.

On December 3, 2015, Pinkerton was sentenced in the instant case. Pinkerton requested sentence credit for the time he spent in jail custody from October 24, 2013, through March 28, 2014. As noted, the circuit court denied his request.

We review the circuit court's application of the sentence credit statute to a given set of facts de novo. *State v. Presley*, 2006 WI App 82, ¶4, 292 Wis. 2d 734, 715 N.W.2d 713. The statute provides that a convicted offender is entitled to sentence credit for custody "in connection with the course of conduct for which sentence was imposed." WIS. STAT. § 973.155(1)(a). The burden is on the offender to demonstrate that custody time meets this "in connection with" requirement. *State v. Carter*, 2010 WI 77, ¶11, 327 Wis. 2d 1, 785 N.W.2d 516.

In arguing that he is entitled to sentence credit, Pinkerton points to a provision in the sentence credit statute stating that the "in connection with" requirement is satisfied when custody time is "in whole or in part the result of a probation ... hold ... for the same course of conduct as

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

No. 2017AP2447-CR

that resulting in the new conviction." See WIS. STAT. § 973.155(1)(b). Pinkerton asserts that his

probation hold and jail time that began on October 24, 2013, was due to the same course of

conduct that resulted in his conviction here. However, Pinkerton does not support this assertion

with any facts of record. Thus, Pinkerton fails to meet his burden to demonstrate that this jail

time was in connection with the course of conduct for which he was convicted here.

A second reason we reject Pinkerton's claim for sentence credit is that Pinkerton does not

dispute the State's assertion that he already received credit for the jail time at issue toward his

March 2014 revocation sentence, and that he completed that sentence before sentence was

imposed here. Thus, we agree with the State that Pinkerton seeks "dual credit" to which he is not

entitled. See State v. Jackson, 2000 WI App 41, ¶19, 233 Wis. 2d 231, 607 N.W.2d 338 ("Since

[the defendant] had already received credit for the custody at issue in this case in [prior]

sentences and since he had already served those sentences, he was not entitled to dual credit for

the same custody in this case.").

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the circuit court's order is summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS.

STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

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

Sheila T. Reiff

Clerk of Court of Appeals

3