

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 31, 2016

To:

Hon. Elliott M. Levine Circuit Court Judge La Crosse County Courthouse 333 Vine Street La Crosse, WI 54601

Pamela Radtke Clerk of Circuit Court La Crosse County Courthouse 333 Vine Street, Room 1200 La Crosse, WI 54601 Thomas J. Balistreri Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 7857 Madison, WI 53707-7857

Tim Gruenke District Attorney 333 Vine St. Rm. 1100 La Crosse, WI 54601

Jerry A. McMahon 240053 Oshkosh Corr. Inst. P.O. Box 3310 Oshkosh, WI 54903-3310

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

2015AP337

State of Wisconsin v. Jerry A. McMahon (L.C. # 1997CF41)

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

Jerry McMahon appeals a circuit court order that denied his latest motion for postconviction relief from a criminal judgment of conviction entered in 1997. After reviewing the record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2013-14). We affirm for the reasons discussed below.

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2013-14 version unless otherwise noted.

McMahon's current motion alleges that he was sentenced based upon inaccurate information because a police report and F.B.I. identification record indicate that he was "charged" with one count of first-degree sexual assault, whereas his attorney told him and the sentencing court stated that he was charged with two counts. Although we fully agree with the circuit court's explanation of how McMahon was confusing the grounds for his arrest with the two charges in the original complaint, we will not address the merits of McMahon's claim because we conclude that it is procedurally barred.

Under *State v. Escalona-Naranjo*, 185 Wis. 2d 168, 185, 517 N.W.2d 157 (1994), claims that could have been raised on a prior direct appeal or postconviction motion from a criminal judgment of conviction cannot be the basis for a subsequent WIS. STAT. § 974.06 motion unless the court finds there was sufficient reason for failing to raise the claim in the earlier proceeding. McMahon asserts in his reply brief that the reason he did not raise his current issue sooner was that he had a golf ball sized tumor removed from his head in 2000, and that he is currently awaiting surgery to deal with an aneurysm in his brain.

While McMahon's tumor might excuse his failure to raise the issue on his direct no-merit appeal or in a number of sentence modification motions he filed prior to 2000, McMahon also filed two prior postconviction motions under WIS. STAT. § 974.06 after the removal of the tumor—one in 2002 and one in 2009. We see nothing in those motions to suggest that McMahon was incompetent at the time they were filed, and McMahon's subsequent aneurysm has no bearing on his earlier failures. We therefore conclude that the issue raised in McMahon's current motion—which is based upon information that has long been available to him—is procedurally barred.

IT IS ORDERED that the circuit court order denying McMahon's postconviction motion for relief based upon allegedly inaccurate sentencing information is summarily affirmed under Wis. Stat. Rule 809.21(1).

Diane M. Fremgen Clerk of Court of Appeals