



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

April 29, 2021

To:

Hon. Gregory J. Potter
Circuit Court Judge
Wood County Courthouse
400 Market St., P.O. Box 8095
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

Cindy Joosten
Clerk of Circuit Court
Wood County Courthouse
P.O. Box 8095
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

David R. Knaapen
Assistant District Attorney
P.O. Box 8095
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54495-8095

Colleen Marion
Assistant State Public Defender
P.O. Box 7862
Madison, WI 53707-7862

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

Spencer A. Victorey 243647
Racine Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 900
Sturtevant, WI 53177-0900

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

2020AP981-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Spencer A. Victorey (L.C. # 2018CF250)

Before Fitzpatrick, P.J., Blanchard, and Nashold, 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).

Attorney Colleen Marion, appointed counsel for Spencer Victorey, has filed a no-merit report seeking to withdraw as appellate counsel. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2019-20)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). The no-merit report addresses whether there

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2019-20 version unless otherwise noted.

would be arguable merit to a challenge to Victorey's plea or sentencing. Victorey was sent a copy of the report, but has not filed a response. Upon independently reviewing the entire record, as well as the no-merit report, we agree with counsel's assessment that there are no arguably meritorious appellate issues. Accordingly, we affirm.

Victorey was charged with ten counts of possession of child pornography and one count of possession of methamphetamine. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Victorey pled no-contest to one count each of possession of child pornography and possession of methamphetamine, the remaining counts were dismissed and read-in, and the State limited its sentencing recommendation to six years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision. The court sentenced Victorey to five years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision. The court also awarded Victorey five days of sentence credit.

The no-merit report addresses whether there would be arguable merit to a challenge to Victorey's plea. A post-sentencing motion for plea withdrawal must establish that plea withdrawal is necessary to correct a manifest injustice, such as a plea that was not knowing, intelligent, and voluntary. *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶18, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. Here, the circuit court conducted a plea colloquy that, together with the plea questionnaire that Victorey signed, satisfied the court's mandatory duties to personally address Victorey and determine information such as Victorey's understanding of the nature of the charges and the range of punishments he faced, the constitutional rights he waived by entering a plea, and the direct consequences of the plea. *See State v. Hoppe*, 2009 WI 41, ¶¶18, 30, 317 Wis. 2d 161, 765 N.W.2d 794. There is no indication of any other basis for plea withdrawal. Accordingly, we agree with counsel's assessment that a challenge to Victorey's plea would lack arguable merit.

A valid guilty plea constitutes a waiver of all nonjurisdictional defects and defenses. *State v. Kelty*, 2006 WI 101, ¶18, 294 Wis. 2d 62, 716 N.W.2d 886.

The no-merit report also addresses whether there would be arguable merit to a challenge to Victorey's sentence. Our review of a sentence determination begins "with the presumption that the [circuit] court acted reasonably, and the defendant must show some unreasonable or unjustifiable basis in the record for the sentence complained of." *State v. Krueger*, 119 Wis. 2d 327, 336, 351 N.W.2d 738 (Ct. App. 1984). Here, the court explained that it considered facts pertinent to the standard sentencing factors and objectives, including the severity of the offenses, Victorey's character, and the need to protect the public. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶39-46 & 43 n.11, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. The sentence was within the maximum Victorey faced and, given the facts of this case, there would be no arguable merit to a claim that the sentence was unduly harsh or excessive. See *State v. Stenzel*, 2004 WI App 181, ¶21, 276 Wis. 2d 224, 688 N.W.2d 20 (a sentence is unduly harsh or excessive "only where the sentence is so excessive and unusual and so disproportionate to the offense committed as to shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper under the circumstances" (quoted source omitted)). An argument that the circuit court erroneously exercised its sentencing discretion would lack arguable merit. Additionally, the court awarded Victorey five days of sentence credit, on counsel's stipulation.

Upon our independent review of the record, we have found no other arguable basis for reversing the judgment of conviction. We conclude that any further appellate proceedings would be wholly frivolous within the meaning of *Anders* and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Colleen Marion is relieved of any further representation of Spencer Victorey in this matter. *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