



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

March 6, 2019

To:

Hon. Michael J. Aprahamian
Circuit Court Judge
Waukesha County Courthouse-Br. 9
515 W. Moreland Blvd.
Waukesha, WI 53188

Gina Colletti
Clerk of Circuit Court
Waukesha County Courthouse
515 W. Moreland Blvd.
Waukesha, WI 53188

Susan Lee Opper
District Attorney
515 W. Moreland Blvd., Rm. G-72
Waukesha, WI 53188-2486

Christopher D. Sobiechowski
Assistant State Public Defender
735 N. Water St., Ste. 912
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4116

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

Charles A. Oliver
411 Darlene Dr., #B
Waukesha, WI 53189

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

2018AP612-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Charles A. Oliver (L.C. #2015CF696)

Before Reilly, P.J., Gundrum and Hagedorn, 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).

Charles Oliver appeals from a judgment sentencing him after revocation of his probation for resisting an officer and causing substantial bodily harm/soft tissue injury as party to the crime

contrary to WIS. STAT. § 946.41(2r) (2017-18).¹ Oliver's appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Oliver received a copy of the report and was advised of his right to file a response. He has not done so. Upon consideration of the report and an independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders* and RULE 809.32, we summarily affirm the judgment because there are no issues that would have arguable merit for appeal. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

The no-merit report addresses whether the circuit court misused its discretion in imposing a four-and-one-half-year sentence (eighteen months of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision) after revocation of Oliver's probation for resisting an officer.

After reviewing the record, we conclude that counsel's no-merit report properly analyzes the sentencing after revocation.² The circuit court's duty at sentencing after probation revocation was 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. In fashioning the sentence after revocation, the court considered Oliver's character and offense history, his failure on probation, his commission of new crimes, and the need to protect the public. *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76.³ The weight to be given to the various factors was within the circuit court's discretion. *State v. Stenzel*, 2004 WI App 181, ¶16, 276 Wis. 2d 224, 688 N.W.2d

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2017-18 version unless otherwise noted.

² Any challenge to the underlying conviction for possession of tetrahydrocannabinols is outside the scope of this appeal. *State ex rel. Marth v. Smith*, 224 Wis. 2d 578, 582 n.5, 592 N.W.2d 307 (Ct. App. 1999). In addition, review of probation revocation is by way of certiorari review to the court of conviction. *Id.* at 583.

³ The circuit court also properly considered the facts of a felon in possession of a firearm offense for which Oliver was acquitted. *State v. Leitner*, 2002 WI 77, ¶45, 253 Wis. 2d 449, 646 N.W.2d 341.

20. The discretion of the sentencing judge was exercised on a “rational and explainable basis.” *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶76, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197 (citation omitted). There would be no arguable merit to a challenge to the sentence.

Our independent review of the record did 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, affirm the judgment of conviction and relieve Attorney Christopher Sobic of further representation of Oliver in this matter.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Christopher Sobic is relieved of further representation of Charles Oliver in this matter.

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

Sheila T. Reiff
Clerk of Court of Appeals