



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

February 17, 2026

To:

Hon. Michael J. Hanrahan
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Anna Hodges
Clerk of Circuit Court
Milwaukee County Safety Building
Electronic Notice

Katie Babe
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Ladairyon Jaquon Moore 720552
Racine Youthful Offender Corr. Facility
P.O. Box 44380
Racine, WI 53404

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

2024AP2357-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Ladairyon Jaquon Moore
(L.C. # 2021CF4825)

Before Colón, P.J., Donald, and Geenen, 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).

Ladairyon Jaquon Moore appeals a judgment convicting him of one count of first-degree reckless injury with the use of a dangerous weapon and one count of possession of a firearm by an adjudicated delinquent. Appellate counsel, Frances Reynolds Colbert,¹ filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).²

¹ Attorney Colbert filed the no-merit report but has since withdrawn as Moore's counsel. The Office of the State Public Defender has appointed successor counsel, Attorney Katie Babe, for Moore.

² All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

Moore received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and has not responded. We have independently reviewed the record and the no-merit report as mandated by *Anders*. We conclude that there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

On November 2, 2021, the State charged Moore with one count of first-degree reckless injury with the use of a dangerous weapon and one count of possession of a firearm by an adjudicated delinquent. Moore ultimately pled guilty to the charges. The circuit court conducted a colloquy with Moore and accepted his pleas. The court sentenced Moore to ten years of imprisonment on the reckless injury charge, consisting of five years of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision. On the gun possession charge, the court sentenced Moore to five years of imprisonment, consisting of three years of initial confinement followed by two years extended supervision, to run consecutive. The court made Moore immediately eligible for early release programming on the gun possession count.

Appellate counsel's no-merit report addresses two issues: (1) whether Moore's pleas were knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; and (2) whether the circuit court properly exercised its sentencing discretion.

With regard to Moore's guilty pleas, our review of the record—including the plea questionnaire/waiver of rights form, the addendum, the jury instructions, and the plea hearing transcript—confirms that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking guilty pleas, pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 971.08, *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 261-62, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986), and *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. These obligations exist specifically to help ensure the validity of any plea. We thus agree with

appellate counsel's conclusion in the no-merit report that there is no arguable merit to seeking plea withdrawal based on a claim that Moore's pleas were anything other than knowing, intelligent, and voluntary.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing decision, we note that sentencing is a matter for the circuit court's discretion. *See State v. Gillion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. At sentencing, a court must consider the principal objectives of sentencing, including the protection of the community, the punishment and rehabilitation of the defendant, and deterrence to others. *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. It must also determine which objective or objectives are of greatest importance. *Gillion*, 270 Wis. 2d 535, ¶41. In seeking to fulfill the sentencing objectives, the court should consider several primary factors, including the gravity of the offense, the character of the offender, and the protection of the public, and it may consider additional factors. *State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695. The weight to be given to each factor is committed to the court's discretion. *Id.* Our review of the record confirms that the court appropriately considered the relevant sentencing objectives and factors. The court specifically focused on Moore's character and history of poor decision-making. The resulting sentence was within the potential maximum authorized by law, *see State v. Scaccio*, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622 N.W.2d 449, and is not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment, *see Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

Our independent review of the record reveals no other potential issues of arguable merit.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Katie Babe is relieved of further representation of Ladairyon Jaquon Moore 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*