



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

March 24, 2026

To:

Hon. Michael J. Hanrahan
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Carl W. Chesshir
Electronic Notice

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

Patrick Donovan Hudson 501363
Stanley Correctional Institution
100 Corrections Dr.
Stanley, WI 54768

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP286-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Patrick Donovan Hudson
(L.C. # 2020CF2524)

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).

Counsel for Patrick Donovan Hudson has filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Hudson's convictions for four counts of delivering schedule II narcotics and one count of delivering a controlled substance (heroin) in an amount greater than ten grams but not more than fifty grams. Hudson was informed of his right to file a response to

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version unless otherwise noted

the no-merit report, and he has not responded. Upon consideration of the no-merit report, and following an independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders*, we conclude that no arguably meritorious issues exist for an appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

An amended information charged Hudson with five counts of delivering schedule II narcotics; one count of delivering a schedule IV narcotic and one count of delivering heroin in an amount greater than ten grams but not more than fifty grams. The charges arose from allegations that Hudson sold narcotics and heroin to a confidential informant during a series of controlled buys. Hudson was arrested at his residence and found in possession of the cell phone that had been used to make arrangements with the confidential informant for the various drug sales.

In exchange for Hudson's guilty pleas to four counts of delivering schedule II narcotics and one count of delivering heroin, the State agreed to recommend that the circuit court dismiss and read in the remaining counts. The State also agreed to recommend a total of fourteen years of initial confinement, with defense counsel free to argue at sentencing. Out of a maximum total potential sentence of 85 years, the court imposed concurrent sentences resulting in an aggregate thirteen-year term, consisting of eight years of initial confinement followed by five years of extended supervision.²

² Although the no-merit report states that Hudson faced a maximum total sentence of 100 years, Hudson's exposure was reduced by fifteen years when the State amended the delivery of heroin charge from more than fifty grams, a Class C felony, to more than ten but not more than fifty grams, which is a Class D felony. Despite this misstatement in the no-merit report, the record shows that during the plea colloquy, Hudson was properly informed of the maximum penalties he faced for each crime to which he pleaded guilty.

The no-merit report addresses whether Hudson knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered his guilty pleas; whether the circuit court properly exercised its sentencing discretion; and whether there is any arguable merit to a claim that trial counsel was ineffective by failing to pursue an entrapment defense. Upon reviewing the record, we agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that there is no arguable merit to any of these issues. 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. Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issue for appeal.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Carl W. Chesshir is relieved of his obligation to further represent Hudson 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