

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 10, 2023

To:

Hon. Marc A. Hammer

Circuit Court Judge

Electronic Notice

Electronic Notice

Criminal Appeals Unit
John VanderLeest Department of Justice
Clerk of Circuit Court P.O. Box 7857

Brown County Courthouse Madison, WI 53707-7857

Electronic Notice

Milton L. Wright 679402

Daniel Goggin II Black River Correctional Cntr.

Electronic Notice W6898 E. Staffon Rd.

Black River Falls, WI 54615-0433

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

2020AP561-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Milton L. Wright (L. C. No. 2018CF724)

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 Milton Wright has filed a no-merit report concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Wright's conviction for robbery by use of force, as a party to the crime, contrary to WIS. STAT. § 943.32(1)(a) (2019-20). Wright was informed of his right to file a response to the no-merit report, and he has not responded. Upon our independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), we conclude there is no arguable merit

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

to any issue that could be raised on appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment of conviction. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

The State charged Wright with one count of armed robbery with use of force, as a party to a crime. According to the complaint, Ryan² reported to police that a recent acquaintance came to his Green Bay apartment with four people who were unknown to Ryan—two men and two women—and they stayed there for approximately thirty minutes. As the people were leaving the apartment, the two men Ryan had just met grabbed him and started punching him before throwing him to the ground. The men tied Ryan's hands behind his back and threatened to shoot him if he moved. The men stole Ryan's wallet, tablet, cellphone, keys, safe, and shoes, along with other electronics from the apartment. One of the two women who was at the apartment was later identified, and she reported to police that she witnessed Wright and his cousin grab Ryan and heard punches as she stood by the door. The witness later saw Ryan bleeding as he lay on the ground, and she observed Wright leave the apartment with televisions, computers, a safety box, and clothing. A few months later, Wright was arrested near Milwaukee on outstanding warrants and possession of drugs. Upon a search of Wright's person and vehicle, Ryan's identification card, debit card, and credit cards were found.

Wright moved to dismiss the case based on the fourteen-month delay between the alleged offense and the filing of the complaint. Because the State sought an adjournment of the scheduled trial due to the unavailability of a crucial witness, Wright also asserted that the case should be dismissed based upon the State's failure to timely prosecute the case. Finally, Wright

² Pursuant to the policy underlying WIS. STAT. RULE 809.86(4), we use a pseudonym instead of the victim's name.

argued the case should be dismissed because the State failed to promptly satisfy his discovery demand. After a hearing, the circuit court denied the motion to dismiss.

Wright waived his right to a jury trial in favor of a trial to the circuit court, to which the State did not object. After a court trial, the court found Wright guilty of the lesser-included offense of robbery by use of force, as a party to the crime. Out of a maximum possible fifteen-year sentence, the court imposed a six-year term, consisting of two years of initial confinement followed by four years of extended supervision, to run consecutive to any sentence Wright was then serving.

The no-merit report addresses whether there are any grounds to challenge the circuit court's denial of Wright's motion to dismiss; whether Wright made a knowing and voluntary waiver of his right to a jury trial; whether there was sufficient credible evidence to support the finding of guilt; and whether the court properly exercised its sentencing discretion. Upon our review of the record, 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 we need not address them further. Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issue for appeal.

Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment is summarily affirmed pursuant to Wis. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Daniel R. Goggin II is relieved of his obligation to further represent Milton Wright 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