



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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT II**

February 19, 2020

To:

Hon. Laura F. Lau  
Circuit Court Judge  
Waukesha County Courthouse  
515 W. Moreland Blvd.  
Waukesha, WI 53188

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

Kathilynne Grotelueschen  
Assistant State Public Defender  
P.O. Box 7862  
Madison, WI 53707

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

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

Raymon Lewis, #177097  
Waupun Correctional Inst.  
P.O. Box 351  
Waupun, WI 53963-0351

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

---

2019AP1582-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Raymon Lewis (L.C. #2017CF1466)

Before Neubauer, C.J., Reilly, P.J., and Davis, 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).**

Raymon Lewis appeals from a judgment convicting him of armed robbery. Lewis's appointed appellate counsel has filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2017-

18)<sup>1</sup> and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Lewis was advised of his right to file a response but has not done so. Upon consideration of the no-merit report and an independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders* and RULE 809.32, we summarily affirm the judgment because there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Lewis entered a restaurant and asked for change for a dollar. When the person at the counter opened the till, Lewis allegedly brandished a gun and demanded all of the money in the drawer.<sup>2</sup> He made off with approximately \$200. Lewis was charged with armed robbery and entered a guilty plea.<sup>3</sup>

The circuit court granted Lewis's request to appear by video for sentencing to better accommodate his physical limitations. The court called his offense "extremely dangerous"; noted that the community "absolutely" needs protection from him, as he has "terrorized Milwaukee and Waukesha Counties with [his] behavior"; and observed that there "[a]bsolutely ... is a moral need for punishment." The court sentenced him to twenty years' imprisonment: ten years' initial confinement plus ten years' extended supervision, consecutive to any other sentence. This no-merit appeal followed.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Lewis's counsel told the court at the plea hearing that, if the matter had gone to trial, "there would have been some dispute" as to whether Lewis actually had a weapon, but said the victim would testify that she saw one, and that even if there was not, the threat of use of a weapon would be sufficient to satisfy the element. *See* WIS. STAT. § 943.32(2). Lewis then agreed that the facts set forth in the complaint were substantially true and correct so as to establish a factual basis for his plea.

<sup>3</sup> Lewis has a criminal history that includes convictions for twelve other armed robberies, several thefts, and a car jacking. He states that he does it to support a drug habit.

The no-merit report considers two issues: whether Lewis' guilty plea was knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered, and whether there are any arguably meritorious grounds on which to challenge the sentence imposed. Our review of the record satisfies us that the no-merit report thoroughly and properly analyzes these potential issues. As we agree with counsel's conclusion that they are without merit, we address them no further. We add only that Lewis's guilty plea, knowingly and understandingly made, constitutes a waiver of all nonjurisdictional defects and defenses including claimed violations of constitutional rights. *See State v. Kraemer*, 156 Wis. 2d 761, 765, 457 N.W.2d 562 (Ct. App. 1990).

Upon the foregoing reasons,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathilynne Grotelueschen is relieved from further representing Lewis 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*