



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 II**

July 17, 2024

To:

Hon. Robert S. Repischak  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Amy Vanderhoef  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Racine County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

Leonard D. Kachinsky  
Electronic Notice

Jennifer L. Vandermeuse  
Electronic Notice

Dashari D. Watson #710229  
Racine Youthful Offender Corr. Facility  
P.O. Box 2500  
Racine, WI 53404-2500

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

---

2023AP432-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Dashari D. Watson (L.C. #2020CF637)

Before Gundrum, P.J., Grogan and Lazar, 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).**

Dashari D. Watson appeals from a judgment, entered following his no-contest pleas, convicting him of first-degree reckless injury and first-degree recklessly endangering safety, both charges as party to a crime and with the use-of-a-dangerous-weapon enhancer. Watson's appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2021-22)<sup>1</sup> and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Watson was advised of his right to file a response,

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2021-22 version unless otherwise noted.

and he has not responded. After reviewing the record and counsel's report, we conclude that there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

On June 2, 2020, at North Beach in Racine, there was a gang-related shooting during which rival gang members opened fire at each other. Five people were injured by the gunfire. There were dozens of citizens at the beach and near the area during this time. Video surveillance showed Watson engaging in the fight by firing a gun toward one rival gang member's vehicle. The State charged Watson and six co-defendants with five counts of first-degree reckless injury (for each of the victims injured by the gunfire) and one count of first-degree recklessly endangering safety (for endangering the general public during the gun fight). All charges were charged as party to a crime and with the use-of-a-dangerous-weapon enhancer.

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Watson pled no contest to one count of first-degree reckless injury and the count of first-degree recklessly endangering safety, both charges as party to a crime and with the use-of-a-dangerous-weapon enhancer. The State recommended a cumulative sentence of ten years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision. The circuit court sentenced Watson to a cumulative sentence of thirteen years of initial confinement and thirteen years of extended supervision.<sup>2</sup>

We first agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that any challenge to the validity of Watson's pleas would lack arguable merit. *See State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 260, 389

---

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the court sentenced Watson to ten years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision on the first-degree reckless injury charge and three years of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision on the first-degree recklessly endangering safety charge. The sentences were consecutive to each other.

N.W.2d 12 (1986). Our review of the record and of counsel's analysis in the no-merit report satisfies us that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking Watson's pleas. *See* WIS. STAT. § 971.08; *Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d at 261-62; *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906.

The no-merit report also discusses whether there were any pretrial issues that were preserved despite Watson's pleas or should have been preserved before his pleas. No suppression motions were filed in these cases. We agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that there are no issues of arguable merit for appeal on these topics.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing discretion, our review of the record confirms that the court appropriately considered the relevant sentencing objectives and factors. *See State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695; *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. The sentence was not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment. *See Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975). Therefore, there would be no arguable merit to a challenge to the court's sentencing discretion.

Our independent review of the record does not disclose any potentially meritorious issue for appeal. Because we conclude that there would be no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal, we accept the no-merit report and relieve Attorney Leonard D. Kachinsky of further representation in this matter.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the circuit court is summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Leonard D. Kachinsky is relieved of further representation of Dashari D. Watson 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*