



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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT I**

July 7, 2026

To:

Hon. Laura Crivello  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

Christina C. Starner  
Electronic Notice

Tyrail D. Redd 671272  
Stanley Correctional Institution  
100 Corrections Drive  
Stanley, WI 54768

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

---

2025AP334-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Tyrail D. Redd (L.C. # 2022CF2599)

Before Donald, C.J., Geenen, and Petrashek, 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).**

Tyrail D. Redd appeals the judgment convicting him of first-degree recklessly endangering safety by use of a dangerous weapon, as a repeater, and possession of a firearm by a felon. His appellate counsel, Christina C. Starner, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)<sup>1</sup> and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Redd received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and did not do so. We have independently reviewed the record and the no-merit report as mandated by *Anders*, and we

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

conclude that there is no issue of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm.

The complaint alleged that upon arriving at the crime scene, police officers observed a victim, referred to in the complaint as “JMG,” who was shot in the back. When she was interviewed five days after the shooting, JMG told the officers that she was sitting in the driver’s seat of her vehicle when she saw another vehicle quickly approaching. JMG saw Redd, who was someone she recognized, hanging out of the approaching vehicle with a firearm. JGM heard two shots and realized that she had been shot. Officers observed seven bullet strikes to the back of JMG’s vehicle and recovered seven 9mm casings. Officers showed JMG a photo array and she identified Redd as the shooter. That same day, officers arrested Redd and recovered a 9mm handgun from his pocket. The complaint additionally alleged that Redd had prior felony convictions and was prohibited from possessing a firearm.

The case proceeded to a jury trial. However, on what would have been the second day of trial, the parties informed the circuit court that they had reached a plea agreement. Pursuant to the agreement, the State filed an information amending count one to first-degree recklessly endangering safety by use of a dangerous weapon, as a repeater. In exchange for Redd’s guilty pleas to count one and count three in the amended information, the State moved to dismiss outright the repeater enhancer attached to count three and agreed to recommend a sentence of six to seven years initial confinement in prison, consecutive to Redd’s revocation sentence. Count two was to be dismissed but read in at sentencing. The agreement left Redd free to argue with regard to his sentence. Following a colloquy, the court accepted Redd’s pleas.

Prior to sentencing, Redd moved the circuit court to withdraw his guilty plea. In the motion, trial counsel asserted that the State extended the plea offer to Redd shortly before jury selection, which was less than 24 hours before Redd entered his guilty pleas. Trial counsel further asserted that since entering his pleas, Redd repeatedly expressed his actual innocence, expressed confusion regarding the nature of the plea in light of the short amount of time he had to consider it, and stated that counsel was ineffective in advising him regarding the plea.

The circuit court held a hearing on the motion. At that time, trial counsel informed the court that Redd had changed his mind about seeking plea withdrawal and no longer wished to move forward with the motion. The court proceeded to inform Redd that he had two options: (1) to proceed with the motion, which would require trial counsel to withdraw because of the ineffective assistance of counsel claim; or (2) to inform the court that he did not want to withdraw his pleas or have his trial counsel withdraw. Redd informed the court that he wished to proceed with sentencing.

On count one, the circuit court sentenced Redd to 12 years imprisonment, comprised of 7 years' initial confinement and 5 years' extended supervision.<sup>2</sup> On count three, the court sentenced Redd to ten years imprisonment, comprised of five years initial confinement and five years extended supervision, concurrent with count one but consecutive to any other sentence.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Initially the circuit court ordered Redd to serve ten years of extended supervision on count one. The court, however, subsequently commuted the term of extended supervision to five years.

<sup>3</sup> The Honorable David Feiss presided over the plea hearing and the hearing on Redd's motion to withdraw his pleas. The Honorable Laura Crivello, who was assigned to this matter as a result of judicial rotation, sentenced Redd.

The no-merit report addresses whether Redd’s pleas were entered knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently. The plea colloquy sufficiently complied with the requirements of *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906, and WIS. STAT. § 971.08 relating to the nature of the charges, the rights Redd was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the pleas. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report also addresses Redd’s sentences. The sentences are within the legal maximums. As to discretionary issues, the standards for the circuit court and this court are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶17-51, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. In this case, the circuit court considered appropriate factors, did not consider improper factors, and reached a reasonable result. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Starner is relieved of further representation of Redd in these matters. *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*