



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 III

August 23, 2022

To:

Hon. Tammy Jo Hock
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

John VanderLeest
Clerk of Circuit Court
Brown County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Winn S. Collins
Electronic Notice

Daniel Goggin II
Electronic Notice

David L. Lasee
Electronic Notice

Jill Annette Worth 683170
Taycheedah Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 3100
Fond du Lac, WI 54936-3100

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

2020AP913-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Jill Annette Worth
2020AP914-CRNM (L. C. Nos. 2018CM1654, 2019CF92)

Before Stark, P.J., Hruz and Gill, 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).

Counsel for Jill Worth has filed a no-merit report concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Worth's convictions for armed robbery, attempted armed robbery, and retail theft, all counts as party to a crime. Worth was informed of her right to file a response to the no-merit report, and she has not responded. Upon our independent review of the records as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), we conclude there is no arguable merit to any issue

that could be raised on appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgments of conviction. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2019-20).¹

Worth was charged in Brown County case Nos. 2018CM1654 and 2019CF92 with misdemeanor bail jumping and as a party to a crime for charges of retail theft, conspiracy to commit armed robbery, armed robbery, and attempted armed robbery. The State alleged that Worth, claiming she had car problems, lured a victim away from a gas station so she and an associate could attempt to rob him. The State also alleged that on the same evening, Worth was involved with the attempted armed robbery of a woman and her twelve-year-old daughter, and the separate armed robbery of a male victim. In the misdemeanor case, the State alleged that Worth and two associates stole merchandise from a grocery store.

In exchange for Worth's no-contest pleas to armed robbery and attempted armed robbery in one case, and her guilty plea to retail theft in the other case—all as a party to a crime—the State agreed to recommend that the circuit court dismiss and read in the remaining counts. The parties sought a presentence investigation report (PSI), and Worth sought an alternative PSI. The parties further noted that if, following the receipt of the PSIs, they were in joint agreement as to a sentence recommendation, that recommendation would be for an aggregate sentence of nine years of initial confinement followed by nine years of extended supervision. If Worth did not ultimately agree to join in that recommendation, the State would recommend an aggregate sentence of eleven years of initial confinement followed by eleven years of extended supervision. At sentencing, defense counsel recommended “a sentence in the neighborhood of three years of

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

initial confinement followed by three years of extended supervision.” The State consequently recommended the higher of the two referenced sentences, consistent with the parties’ agreement. Out of a maximum possible sentence of sixty years and nine months, the court imposed concurrent sentences resulting in an aggregate thirteen-year term, consisting of eight years of initial confinement followed by five years of extended supervision.

The no-merit report addresses whether Worth knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered her no-contest and guilty pleas; whether the circuit court erroneously exercised its sentencing discretion; whether there are any grounds to challenge the effectiveness of Worth’s trial counsel; and whether there are any new factors warranting sentence modification. Upon reviewing the records, we agree with counsel’s analysis and conclusion that there is no arguable merit to any of these issues. The no-merit report sets forth an adequate discussion of these potential issues to support the no-merit conclusion, and we need not address them further. Our independent review of the records discloses no other potential issue for appeal.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgments are summarily affirmed. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Daniel Goggin II is relieved of his obligation to further represent Jill Worth in these matters. *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