



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 12, 2022

To:

Hon. Janet C. Protasiewicz
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

George Tauscheck
Electronic Notice

George Christenson
Clerk of Circuit Court
Milwaukee County Safety Building
Electronic Notice

Akeam Williams 613242
Dodge Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 700
Waupun, WI 53963-0700

Winn S. Collins
Electronic Notice

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

2021AP1875-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Akeam Williams (L.C. # 2016CF2653)
2021AP1876-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Akeam Williams (L.C. # 2017CF5534)

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

Akeam Williams appeals judgments convicting him, pursuant to his guilty pleas, of four crimes: two counts of felony murder, one count of fleeing an officer, and one count of burglary, as a party to a crime. Appellate counsel, Attorney George Tauscheck, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2019-20).¹ Williams was informed of his right to file a response, but he did not respond. Upon

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

consideration of the no-merit report and an independent review of the records as mandated by *Anders*, we conclude that there are no arguably meritorious appellate issues. Therefore, we summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Williams engaged in a series of shootings, armed robberies, and homicides from December 3, 2015, until May 15, 2016. After he was apprehended, Williams was charged with thirteen crimes, including two counts of felony murder. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Williams pled guilty to two counts of felony murder, one count of burglary, as a party to a crime, and one count of fleeing an officer. The circuit court sentenced him to an aggregate term of thirty-five years of initial confinement and fifteen years of extended supervision.

We first consider whether Williams could pursue an arguably meritorious claim for plea withdrawal on the ground that his guilty pleas were not knowing, intelligent, and voluntary. *See State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 257, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986). The circuit court established at the plea hearing that Williams understood the nature of the crimes to which he was pleading guilty, the penalties he faced, and the constitutional rights he was waiving by entering the pleas. The circuit court also established that Williams had signed a guilty plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form and addendum and that he understood their contents.² *See State v. Pegeese*, 2019 WI 60, ¶¶36-37, 387 Wis. 2d 119, 928 N.W.2d 590. The circuit court then conducted a colloquy with Williams that complied with the circuit court's obligations when accepting a guilty plea. *See id.*, ¶23; *see also* WIS. STAT. § 971.08. The plea hearing transcript and other record

² Williams completed one form that pertained to both cases.

documents demonstrate that Williams entered his guilty pleas knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily. Further pursuit of this issue would be frivolous within the meaning of *Anders*.

We also conclude that Williams could not pursue an arguably meritorious challenge to the circuit court's exercise of sentencing discretion. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis.2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. The circuit court imposed twenty-five years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision on the first count of felony murder. The circuit court imposed ten years of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision on the second count of felony murder, to be served consecutively. The circuit court also imposed concurrent terms of two years of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision for burglary, as a party to a crime, and one year of initial confinement and one year of extended supervision for fleeing an officer. The circuit court indicated that its primary concern was the protection of the community because Williams participated in a crime spree over six or seven months that tore his community apart and made people afraid to leave their homes. The circuit court discussed the sentencing factors that it viewed as relevant to achieving its goals of protecting the community and deterring the type of conduct in which Williams engaged. See *id.*, ¶¶41-43. The imposed sentences were well within the limits of the maximum sentences allowed by law and cannot be considered unduly harsh or unconscionable. See *State v. Grindemann*, 2002 WI App 106, ¶¶31-32, 255 Wis. 2d 632, 648 N.W.2d 507. Further pursuit of this issue would be frivolous within the meaning of *Anders*.

Our independent review of the record does not disclose any other potential issues warranting discussion. We conclude that further postconviction or appellate proceedings would be wholly frivolous within the meaning of *Anders* and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney George Tauscheck is relieved of any further representation of Akeam Williams. *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