

## 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 I

July 20, 2021

*To*:

Hon. Janet C. Protasiewicz Circuit Court Judge Electronic Notice

John Barrett Clerk of Circuit Court Milwaukee County Electronic Notice

Winn S. Collins Electronic Notice

John D. Flynn Electronic Notice

George Tauscheck Electronic Notice

Willie Edward Harvey Jr. 531231 Redgranite Correctional Inst. P.O. Box 925

Redgranite, WI 54970-0925

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

2020AP1503-CRNM

State of Wisconsin v. Willie Edward Harvey, Jr.

(L.C. # 2019CF55)

Before Brash, P.J., Donald and White, 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).

Willie Edward Harvey, Jr., appeals from a judgment of conviction, following a guilty plea, of second-degree sexual assault of a child under the age of sixteen. *See* WIS. STAT. § 948.02(2) (2019-20).<sup>1</sup> His appellate counsel, George Tauscheck, has filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Harvey received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and did not do so. We

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2019-20 version unless otherwise noted.

have independently reviewed the record and no-merit report as mandated by *Anders*. We conclude that there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We, therefore, summarily affirm.

In a criminal complaint filed on January 4, 2019, the State charged Harvey with one count of second-degree sexual assault of a child. The complaint alleged that Harvey engaged in sexual intercourse with fifteen-year-old A.C. and provided her with drugs in exchange for sex. Results from a sexual assault treatment exam indicated that Harvey's DNA was found on vaginal swabs taken from A.C. The complaint further alleges that Harvey, then twenty-seven years old, acknowledged that he knew A.C. and had sex with her.

On September 26, 2019, pursuant to a plea agreement, Harvey signed a plea questionnaire/waiver of rights form. The plea agreement called for the State to recommend a sentence of three years of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision, consecutive to his revocation sentence.

At the plea hearing, the circuit court conducted a plea colloquy and accepted Harvey's guilty plea. The circuit court rejected the State's sentencing recommendation and sentenced Harvey to seven years of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision, consecutive to his revocation sentence.

The no-merit report addresses two potential issues: (1) whether Harvey's guilty plea was knowing, voluntary, and intelligent; and (2) whether the circuit court properly exercised its discretion during sentencing.

Our review of the record—including the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, the addendum, the jury instructions that were signed by Harvey, and the plea hearing transcript—confirms that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking guilty pleas, pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 971.08, *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 261-62, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986), and *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. These obligations exist specifically to help ensure the validity of any plea. We thus agree with appellate counsel's conclusion in the no-merit report that there is no arguable merit to seeking plea withdrawal based on a claim that Harvey's pleas were anything other than knowing, intelligent, and voluntary.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing decision, we note that sentencing is a matter for the circuit court's discretion. *See State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. At sentencing, a court must consider the principal objectives of sentencing, including the protection of the community, the punishment and rehabilitation of the defendant, and deterrence to others. *See State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. It must also determine which objective or objectives are of greatest importance. *See Gallion*, 270 Wis. 2d 535, ¶41. In seeking to fulfill the sentencing objectives, the circuit court should consider several primary factors, including the gravity of the offense, the character of the offender, and the protection of the public, and it may consider additional factors. *See State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695. The weight to be given to each factor is committed to the circuit court's discretion. *See id.* 

Our review of the record confirms that the circuit court appropriately considered relevant sentencing objectives and factors. The circuit court explained its reasons for rejecting the State's sentencing recommendation. The resulting ten year sentence is well within the potential maximum authorized by law, *see State v. Scaccio*, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622

No. 2020AP1503-CRNM

N.W.2d 449, and is not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment, see Ocanas v. State,

70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. Accordingly, this

court accepts the no-merit report, affirms the judgment of conviction, and discharges appellate

counsel of the obligation to represent Harvey further in this appeal.

Upon the foregoing, therefore,

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

RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney George Tauscheck is relieved of further

representation of Harvey 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

4