



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 IV**

October 10, 2024

To:

Hon. Nicholas J. Brazeau Jr.  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Kimberly Stimac  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Wood County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

George Tauscheck  
Electronic Notice

Jennifer L. Vandermeuse  
Electronic Notice

Mylek Z. Crawford 673698  
Wisconsin Resource Center  
P.O. Box 220  
Winnebago, WI 54985-0220

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

---

2023AP981-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Mylek Z. Crawford (L.C. # 2021CF201)

Before Kloppenburg, P.J., Graham, and Taylor, 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).**

Attorney George Tauscheck, appointed counsel for Mylek Crawford, has filed a no-merit report seeking to withdraw as appellate counsel pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2021-22) and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967).<sup>1</sup> Crawford was sent a copy of the report and has not filed a response. Upon consideration of the report and an independent review of the record, we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal. Accordingly, we affirm.

---

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

Crawford was charged with one count of second-degree sexual assault and three counts of bail jumping. A jury found him guilty of the lesser included offense of third-degree sexual assault and of all three bail jumping charges. The circuit court sentenced him to four years of initial confinement and four years of extended supervision on the sexual assault charge and to two years of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision on each of the bail jumping charges, with all of the sentences to run concurrent with one another.

The no-merit report addresses whether Crawford could challenge the sufficiency of the evidence. We agree with counsel that there is no arguable merit to this issue. An appellate court will not overturn a conviction “unless the evidence, viewed most favorably to the state and the conviction, is so insufficient in probative value and force that it can be said as a matter of law that no trier of fact, acting reasonably, could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.” *State v. Poellinger*, 153 Wis. 2d 493, 501, 451 N.W.2d 752 (1990). Without reciting all of the evidence, we conclude that it was sufficient.

Although the no-merit report does not address whether there are other issues of arguable merit relating to pretrial or trial proceedings, we conclude based on our independent review of the record that there are none. This includes any potential issues relating to pretrial rulings, jury selection, opening statements, evidentiary rulings at trial, Crawford’s decision to testify, closing arguments, and jury instructions.

The no-merit report addresses whether Crawford could challenge his sentences as an erroneous exercise of the circuit court’s sentencing discretion. We agree with counsel that he could not. The circuit court addressed the required sentencing factors along with other relevant factors. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶37-49, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197

(explaining sentencing standards and factors). The court did not rely on any improper factors. Crawford could not reasonably argue that his sentences were unduly harsh or so excessive as to shock public sentiment. *See Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975) (a circuit court erroneously exercises its discretion when “the sentence is so excessive and unusual and so disproportionate to the offense committed as to shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper under the circumstances”). We see no other arguable basis on which he might challenge his sentences.

Our review of the record discloses no other issues with arguable merit.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that George Tauscheck is relieved of any further representation of Mylek Crawford 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*