Case 2024XX001148 Court Order of 7/5/24 Filed 07-05-2024 Page 1 of 1

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

## Supreme Court of Misconsin

FILED 07-05-2024 CLERK OF WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT



110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215 P.O. BOX 1688 MADISON, WI 53701-1688

> TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880 FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640 Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

> > July 5, 2024

To:

Hon. Gerald P. Ptacek Reserve Judge

Amy Vanderhoef Clerk of Circuit Court Racine County Courthouse Electronic Notice Jennifer L. Vandermeuse Electronic Notice

Joachim E. Dressler 230174 Waupun Correctional Inst. P.O. Box 351 Waupun, WI 53963-0351

You are hereby notified that the Court, by its Clerk and Commissioners, has entered the following order:

## No. 2024XX1148-CR State v. Dressler, L.C.# 1990CF584

Joachim E. Dressler is the defendant-appellant in an appeal pending in the court of appeals, <u>State v. Dressler</u>, No. 2024AP746-CR. Mr. Dressler has filed in this court a document entitled "Motion for Extension of Time," in which he "moves this Court for an extension of time to file a petition for a supervisory writ in the Wisconsin Supreme Court . . ." In his accompanying cover letter, Mr. Dressler also asks that the pending appeal in the court of appeals be held in abeyance until his forthcoming petition for supervisory writ is resolved.

Mr. Dressler's motion is based on the erroneous belief that there is a 30-day time limit for filing a petition for a supervisory writ in this court. There is a 30-day time limit for filing a petition for review in an appeal following a final decision from the court of appeals, Wis. Stat. § 808.10 and § (Rule) 809.62, but there is no statutory 30-day time limit for filing a petition for supervisory writ. Wis. Stat. § (Rule) 809.71. Consequently, his motion for an extension of time to file a petition for a supervisory writ is dismissed. As this court's appellate or supervisory jurisdiction has not been properly invoked, this court will take no action on the request to hold the pending appeal (No. 2024AP746-CR) in abeyance. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for extension of time is dismissed.