

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

January 5, 2023

To:

Hon. Jay R. Tlusty
Circuit Court Judge
Carl W. Chesshir
Electronic Notice

Electronic Notice

Winn S. Collins
Thomas Barker Electronic Notice

Clerk of Circuit Court

Lincoln County Courthouse Electronic Notice

Galen Bayne-Allison Electronic Notice Electronic Notice

Nacole J. Degner 311 N. Genesee Street Merrill, WI 54452

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

2020AP1373-CRNM 2020AP1374-CRNM 2020AP1375-CRNM 2020AP1376-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Nacole J. Degner

(L. C. Nos. 2017CM120, 2017CM218, 2018CM198, 2019CM23)

Before Hruz, J.¹

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 Nacole Degner has filed a no-merit report concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Degner's convictions for two counts of disorderly conduct and three counts of misdemeanor bail jumping, with all but one of each offense as a repeater. Degner was informed of her right to file a response to the no-merit report, and she has not responded. Upon an

¹ These appeals are decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2) (2019-20). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2019-20 version unless otherwise noted.

Nos. 2020AP1373-CRNM 2020AP1374-CRNM

2020AP1375-CRNM

2020AP1376-CRNM

independent review of the records as mandated by Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967),

this court concludes 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.

The State charged Degner, in four separate Lincoln County Circuit Court cases, with two

counts of disorderly conduct and six counts of misdemeanor bail jumping—with all but one of

each of the offenses as a repeater. One of the disorderly conduct charges arose from allegations

that Degner entered a home in the City of Merrill, screaming and hysterical, and slapped two of

the individuals inside the residence. The other disorderly conduct charge arose from allegations

that Degner yelled at customers in a grocery store demanding "Give me my baby" while using

her finger in the pocket of her sweatshirt to make the customers think she had a gun. With

respect to the bail jumping charges, the State alleged that various conditions of bond were

violated.

During pretrial proceedings, the circuit court granted defense counsel's request for a

competency examination. Following an examination and hearing, Degner was found

incompetent to proceed. The court, however, ordered a re-examination of Degner in three-month

intervals, and, after the first re-examination, Degner was found competent to proceed.

In exchange for her guilty pleas to two counts of disorderly conduct, with one count as a

repeater, and three counts of misdemeanor bail jumping, with two counts as repeaters, the State

agreed to recommend that the circuit court dismiss and read in the remaining charges in these

cases and another case. The State also agreed to join in defense counsel's recommendation for

2

Nos. 2020AP1373-CRNM 2020AP1374-CRNM

2020AP1375-CRNM

2020AP1376-CRNM

withheld sentences and a probationary period of twenty-four months. Out of a maximum

possible aggregate sentence of seven years, the court followed the joint recommendation.

Although the no-merit report does not specifically address it, we conclude there is no

arguable merit to challenge the circuit court's competency determination. "No person who lacks

substantial mental capacity to understand the proceedings or assist in his or her defense may be

tried, convicted, or sentenced for the commission of an offense so long as the incapacity

endures." State v. Byrge, 2000 WI 101, ¶28, 237 Wis. 2d 197, 614 N.W.2d 477 (citation

omitted). To determine legal competency, the circuit court considers a defendant's present

mental capacity to understand and assist at the time of the proceedings. *Id.*, ¶30-31. A circuit

court's competency determination should be reversed only when clearly erroneous. *Id.*, ¶46.

An examining psychologist submitted a re-examination report opining to a reasonable

degree of professional certainty that Degner did not lack the substantial capacity to understand

the charges against her or to assist in her defense, outlining the reasoning behind her opinion. At

the competency hearing, Degner did not contest the psychologist's conclusion. Based on the

psychologist's report, the circuit court found Degner competent to proceed. The record supports

the court's determination.

The no-merit report addresses whether Degner knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily

entered her guilty pleas and whether the circuit court properly exercised its sentencing

3

Nos. 2020AP1373-CRNM 2020AP1374-CRNM

2020AP1375-CRNM

2020AP1376-CRNM

discretion.² Upon reviewing the records, we agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that

there is no arguable merit to these possible issues. The no-merit report sets forth an adequate

discussion of these potential issues to support the no-merit conclusion, and this court need not

address them further. An independent review of the records discloses no other potential issue for

appeal.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgments are summarily affirmed pursuant to WIS. STAT.

RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Carl W. Chesshir is relieved of his obligation

to further represent Nacole Degner 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

² We note that although the plea questionnaire form did not specify the maximum sentences for the offenses that were charged as repeaters, the circuit court properly informed Degner of the maximum possible penalties for each offense.

4