



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 II

July 29, 2026

To:

Hon. Bryan D. Keberlein
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Leonard D. Kachinsky
Electronic Notice

Desiree Bongers
Clerk of Circuit Court
Winnebago County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Morgan Taylor Lund #7258821
Taycheedah Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 3100
Fond du Lac, WI 54936-3100

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

2025AP820-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Morgan Taylor Lund (L.C. #2023CF153)

Before Gundrum, Grogan, and Lazar, 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).

Morgan Taylor Lund appeals from a judgment convicting her of multiple crimes. Her appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Lund filed a response. After reviewing the record, counsel's report, and Lund's response, we conclude there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

Lund was convicted following no-contest pleas to aggravated battery with use of a dangerous weapon and second-degree recklessly endangering safety—both as acts of domestic abuse. The charges stemmed from an incident in which Lund repeatedly stabbed her ex-boyfriend with a pair of scissors.

On the first charge, the circuit court sentenced Lund to seven years and six months of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision. On the second charge, the court withheld sentence and ordered a consecutive five-year period of probation. The court also ordered \$35,507.52 in restitution to reimburse a health insurer. This no-merit appeal follows.

The no-merit report addresses: (1) whether Lund’s pleas were knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered; (2) whether the circuit court properly exercised its discretion at sentencing; and (3) whether there are grounds for resentencing. This court is satisfied that the no-merit report correctly analyzes the issues it raises as without merit.

As noted, Lund filed a response to counsel’s no-merit report. In it, she asks that we reduce her sentence to four years and six months of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision. In doing so, Lund accuses the prosecutor of improperly mentioning the wishes of the victim,² and exaggerating the seriousness of the offenses.³ She also blames her

² The prosecutor simply noted that the victim, who was not present at sentencing, had expressed his wishes in the presentence investigation report. According to that report, the victim said that he believed, “a little bit more in prison [than the State was recommending], such as 10-12 years, would be good[.]” At no point did the prosecutor suggest that the circuit court should follow the victim’s wishes instead of the State’s recommendation.

trial counsel for not contesting the prosecutor's statements at sentencing, and faults the circuit court for not considering mitigating factors.

We are not persuaded that Lund's response presents an issue of arguable merit. To begin, there was nothing improper about the prosecutor referencing the wishes of the victim in her sentencing remarks.⁴ Moreover, there is no indication that the prosecutor exaggerated the seriousness of the offenses. Indeed, the prosecutor provided the circuit court with photographs of the scene and victim so that the court could assess the seriousness of the offenses itself. Finally, Lund's remaining claims are belied by the record. Her trial counsel did contest the prosecutor's statements at sentencing when arguing for an imposed and stayed prison sentence with probation. Likewise, the court did acknowledge mitigating factors before ultimately concluding that they were outweighed by the vicious nature of Lund's assault.

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. Accordingly, this court accepts the no-merit report, affirms the judgment of conviction, and discharges appellate counsel of the obligation to represent Lund further in this appeal.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

³ For example, Lund disputes that the victim suffered 19 stab wounds or that there were "copious amounts of blood" at the scene. However, the complaint, which originally charged Lund with attempted first-degree intentional homicide, expressly states that, "[h]ospital medical staff counted a total of 19 stab wounds" and that one of the responding officers observed, "copious amounts of blood all over the floor and couch in the living room."

⁴ See *State v. Bokenyi*, 2014 WI 61, ¶63, 355 Wis. 2d 28, 848 N.W.2d 759 (the law does not preclude acknowledgement of the victim's wishes).

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Leonard D. Kachinsky is relieved of further representation of Morgan Taylor Lund in this appeal. *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