

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 IV

March 18, 2013

To:

Hon. Roger A. Allen Circuit Court Judge 215 South Hamilton, Br 11, Rm 5103 Madison, WI 53703

Carlo Esqueda Clerk of Circuit Court Room 1000 215 South Hamilton Madison, WI 53703

Sarah Burgundy Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 7857 Madison, WI 53707-7857 Robert J. Kaiser Jr. Asst. District Attorney Rm. 3000 215 South Hamilton

Madison, WI 53703

Eddie G. Evans 85653 Columbia Corr. Inst. P.O. Box 900 Portage, WI 53901-0900

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

2012AP808-CR

State of Wisconsin v. Eddie G. Evans (L.C. # 2003CF1002)

Before Lundsten, P.J., Sherman and Kloppenburg, JJ.

Eddie Evans appeals an order dated April 25, 2012, denying his latest motion for sentence modification. After reviewing the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2011-12). We affirm.

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2011-12 version unless otherwise noted.

No. 2012AP808-CR

The circuit court's order states that the motion was denied "for the reasons stated on the

record." As the State points out, however, the appellate record does not include a transcript of

the hearing at which the circuit court issued its bench ruling.

It is the appellant's responsibility to provide this court with an adequate record. See

Fiumefreddo v. McLean, 174 Wis. 2d 10, 26, 496 N.W.2d 226 (Ct. App. 1993). In the absence

of a complete record, we will assume "that every fact essential to sustain the trial court's

decision is supported by the record." Fischer v. Wisconsin Patients Comp. Fund, 2002 WI App

192, ¶6 n.4, 256 Wis. 2d 848, 650 N.W.2d 75.

Evans asserts that the missing transcript was included in the record for a prior appeal

from the same decision that was dismissed as premature. We do not find that assertion plausible

because: (1) the current record consists of all of the previously filed record items plus three

additional documents that postdate the prior appeal, and (2) the docket entries do not show that

the transcript was ever filed in the circuit court.

Because we cannot meaningfully review the circuit court's decision without the missing

transcript, and because it was the appellant's responsibility to provide that transcript,

IT IS ORDERED that the order denying sentence modification is summarily affirmed

2

pursuant to Wis. Stat. Rule 809.21(1).

Diane M. Fremgen

Clerk of Court of Appeals