



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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT III**

June 20, 2023

To:

Hon. Anthony J. Stella, Jr.  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Matthew J. Tingstad  
300 Taconite Street  
Hurley, WI 54534

Karen Ransanici  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Iron County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

William T. Ford  
73810 Ondossagon Road  
Washburn, WI 54891

Daniel Goggin II  
Electronic Notice

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

---

2021AP2222-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. William T. Ford (L. C. No. 2020CT2)

Before Stark, P.J.<sup>1</sup>

**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).**

Attorney Daniel R. Goggin II, appointed counsel for William Ford, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel provided Ford with a copy of the report, and both counsel and this court advised him of his right to file a response. Ford has not responded. After an independent review of the record, we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2) (2021-22). All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2021-22 version unless otherwise noted.

Ford pled no contest to one count of operating a motor vehicle while revoked. *See* WIS. STAT. § 343.44(1)(b). Pursuant to the plea deal, the State agreed to a joint sentencing recommendation of a ten dollar fine, a jail term of one day, and credit for one day of time served. The circuit court imposed a sentence of thirty days, consecutive to any other sentence, and awarded Ford one day of sentence credit.

The no-merit report addresses whether Ford’s plea was entered knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently. The plea colloquy sufficiently complied with the requirements of *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906, and WIS. STAT. § 971.08 relating to the nature of the charge, the rights Ford was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the plea. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report addresses Ford’s sentence. As explained in the no-merit report, the sentence is within the legal maximum. As to discretionary issues, the standards for the circuit court and this court are well-established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶17-51, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. In this case, the court considered appropriate factors, did not consider improper factors, and reached a reasonable result. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report also discusses whether there would be arguable merit to a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. To establish ineffective assistance of counsel, Ford would have to show that counsel’s performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that Ford was prejudiced as a result. *See Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984). In reviewing trial counsel’s performance, “every effort is made to avoid determinations of ineffectiveness based on hindsight[,] ... and the burden is placed on the defendant to overcome a

strong presumption that counsel acted reasonably within professional norms.” *State v. Johnson*, 153 Wis. 2d 121, 127, 449 N.W.2d 845 (1990). Based upon our review of the record and the no-merit report, we agree with counsel’s conclusion that a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel would be without arguable merit.

An independent review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Daniel Goggin II is relieved of further representation of William Ford in this matter. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32(3).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

---

*Samuel A. Christensen*  
*Clerk of Court of Appeals*