



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

November 17, 2021

To:

Hon. Wynne P. Laufenberg
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Circuit Court
Racine County
Electronic Notice

Patricia J. Hanson
Electronic Notice

Pamela Moorshead
Electronic Notice

Winn S. Collins
Electronic Notice

Victor L. Wright, #624845
New Lisbon Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 2000
New Lisbon, WI 53950-2000

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

2021AP286-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Victor L. Wright (L.C. #2018CF585)

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

Victor L. Wright appeals a judgment of conviction, entered upon his no-contest plea, for first-degree sexual assault of a child under the age of thirteen, contrary to WIS. STAT. § 948.02(1)(e) (2017-18).¹ Wright's appointed appellate counsel has filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Wright was advised of his right to file a response but has not done so. Upon consideration of the no-

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

merit report and an independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders* and RULE 809.32, we conclude there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal and summarily affirm the judgment. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21(1).

Wright was charged on April 30, 2018, with first-degree sexual assault of a child under the age of thirteen and child enticement. According to the criminal complaint, police were dispatched to a motel in Mount Pleasant in response to a woman's complaint that Wright had been touching her nine-year-old autistic granddaughter. The victim reported that, on that particular date, Wright had sexually assaulted her by touching, licking, and placing his "privates" between her legs. She stated Wright had made her touch his privates; he also asked her to lick his privates, which she refused to do. The victim reported that Wright had told her to keep it a secret and not to tell anyone. Wright admitted to a police investigator that he had the victim in his room at the motel and had touched her inappropriately.

Wright pled no contest to first-degree sexual assault of a child under the age of thirteen in exchange for the State's agreement to dismiss and read in the child enticement charge and to recommend a prison sentence consisting of ten years' initial confinement and ten years' extended supervision. After a thorough colloquy, the circuit court accepted Wright's plea, with the parties' stipulation that the complaint provided an adequate factual basis for the crime of conviction. At sentencing, the court considered Wright's character and lengthy criminal history, the effect of Wright's crime on the victim, the significant gravity of the offense, Wright's recurrent drug abuse and attempt to blame narcotics for his crime, and the need to protect the public. The court sentenced Wright to a bifurcated term consisting of sixteen years' initial confinement and nine years' extended supervision.

The no-merit report addresses whether Wright could raise nonfrivolous arguments related to: (1) whether his plea was knowing, intelligent and voluntary; (2) whether there was a factual basis for his plea; and (3) whether the circuit court erroneously exercised its sentencing discretion. Our review of the record satisfies us that the no-merit report thoroughly analyzes these issues and properly concludes any challenge based upon them would lack arguable merit. Our review of the record discloses no other potentially meritorious issues for appeal.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Pamela Moorshead is relieved from further representing Victor L. Wright 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