



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 I

January 27, 2026

To:

Hon. Nidhi Kashyap
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Tammy Kruczynski
Juvenile Clerk
Milwaukee County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Timothy C. Drewa
Electronic Notice

Brighton M. Troha
Electronic Notice

Anne M. Abell
Electronic Notice

J. D. D.

Division of Milwaukee Child Protective
Services
Charmian Klyve
635 North 26th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53233-1803

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

2025AP2592-NM

In re the termination of parental rights to A.T., a person under the
age of 18: State of Wisconsin v. J.D.D. (L.C. # 2024TP168)

Before Colón, P.J.¹

**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).**

Counsel for John filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 concluding
there is no arguable basis for challenging the order terminating John's parental rights to April.²

¹ This appeal is decided by one judge pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 752.31(2)(e) (2023-24). All
references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

² Pursuant to the policy underlying WIS. STAT. RULE 809.81(8), we use pseudonyms when
referring to the parent and child in this confidential matter.

John was advised of his right to respond to the report and he has not responded. Upon this court's independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), no issue of arguable merit appears. Therefore, the order terminating John's parental rights is summarily affirmed.³ See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

April was removed from her parents' care on May 25, 2023, four days after her birth, based in part on the presence of cocaine and Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) in the child's urine, and the absence of safe, stable housing for the child. On January 18, 2024, April was found to be a child in need of protection or services (CHIPS) and placed outside her parental home. The order set forth conditions for returning April to her parents' care. On August 21, 2024, the State petitioned for termination of John's parental rights, alleging the continuing need for protection or services and a failure to assume parental responsibility for April.

John was incarcerated at the time of April's birth, but he was released from custody on November 21, 2023. John first visited April in January 2024, when she was eight months old. Following five more supervised visits, John was taken back into custody for a probation hold on May 9, 2024. John was released on August 26, 2024, and admitted himself into a residential drug treatment program. John was successfully discharged from the treatment program on November 4, 2024, and he had one more visit with April before December 13, 2024, when he was again taken into custody on a probation hold and new charges. John remained incarcerated through the remainder of the termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings.

³ The order also terminated the parental rights of the child's mother. Termination of the mother's parental rights is not the subject of this appeal.

John, by appointed counsel, contested the grounds for termination and waived his right to a jury trial. Following a bench trial, the circuit court found that the State had established the asserted grounds for termination of John's parental rights. The court made the statutorily required finding that John was an unfit parent. After a dispositional hearing, the court concluded it was in April's best interest to terminate John's parental rights.

The no-merit report addresses: (1) whether the TPR petition satisfied the requirements under WIS. STAT. § 48.42(1); (2) whether the fact-finding hearing was properly conducted as a bench trial rather than a jury trial; (3) whether there was sufficient evidence to support the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law as to the grounds for termination; and (4) whether the court properly exercised its discretion in concluding that termination of John's parental rights was in April's best interest. Upon reviewing the record, we agree with counsel's description, analysis, and conclusion that these potential issues lack arguable merit. The no-merit report sets forth an adequate discussion of the potential issues to support the no-merit conclusion, and we need not address them further.

Because this court's independent review of the record confirms that counsel correctly analyzed the issues surrounding this termination, and because this court's review discloses no

other potential issues of arguable merit, the order terminating John’s parental rights is summarily affirmed.⁴

Upon the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that the order is summarily affirmed. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Timothy C. Drewa is relieved of his obligation to further represent John 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

⁴ The no-merit report was filed on December 8, 2025, making John’s response, if any, due by December 22, 2025. John did not file a response. Thus, an opinion from this court was due by January 21, 2026. Conflicts in this court’s calendar and the size of the record in this matter have resulted in a short delay in the opinion’s release. It is therefore necessary for this court to *sua sponte* extend the deadline for a decision in this case. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.82(2)(a) (“the court upon its own motion ... may enlarge or reduce the time prescribed by these rules or court order for doing any act”); ***Rhonda R.D. v. Franklin R.D.***, 191 Wis. 2d 680, 694, 530 N.W.2d 34 (Ct. App. 1995). We extend our deadline accordingly.