



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

July 28, 2026

To:

Hon. Jean M. Kies
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Mark S. Rosen
Electronic Notice

Bryell C. Bonds 720264
Wisconsin Secure Program Facility
P.O. Box 1000
Boscobel, WI 53805-1000

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

2025AP388-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Bryell C. Bonds (L.C. # 2021CF1208)

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).

Bryell C. Bonds appeals from his judgment of conviction for first-degree intentional homicide as a party to a crime. His appellate counsel, Attorney Mark S. Rosen, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ Bonds was advised of his right to file a response, but he did not do so. Upon this court's independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders*, and counsel's report, we

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

conclude there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

In March 2021, Bonds and co-actor Santos M. Solier were charged in the shooting death of Richard Alva. Alva's body was discovered in an alley near his residence with multiple gunshot wounds. Video surveillance footage from the area shows two men, who had driven a dark-colored SUV to the alley, having a verbal exchange with Alva. The video shows that both men were armed. They both began shooting at Alva, who was unarmed, and Alva dropped to the ground. The shooters then fled the scene in the SUV.

Police identified and interviewed a woman who appeared in the video. She provided descriptions and nicknames for the two men in the SUV. The investigation led police to Bonds and Solier as suspects, and the woman identified them in photo line-ups. Both men were charged with first-degree intentional homicide as a party to a crime.

Bonds opted to resolve the charge with a plea. In exchange for his guilty plea to the first-degree intentional homicide charge and his testimony against Solier, the State agreed to recommend that Bonds be granted eligibility for extended supervision. The circuit court imposed the mandatory life sentence with eligibility to be released to extended supervision after thirty years. This no-merit appeal follows.

In the no-merit report, appellate counsel addresses two issues: whether there would be arguable merit to appealing the validity of Bonds' plea; and whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion in sentencing Bonds. We agree with appellate counsel's analysis that there would be no arguable merit to an appeal of either of these issues.

A plea is not constitutionally valid if it is not knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 257, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986). This may be established if the requirements set forth in Wis. STAT. § 971.08 and *Bangert* are not met during the plea colloquy by the circuit court. *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶¶23, 34-35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906.

The record reflects that the plea colloquy by the circuit court complied with these requirements. Furthermore, the circuit court confirmed that Bonds signed and understood the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, which further demonstrates that Bonds' plea was knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. See *State v. Moederndorfer*, 141 Wis. 2d 823, 827, 416 N.W.2d 627 (Ct. App. 1987). We therefore agree with appellate counsel's assessment that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of the validity of Bonds' plea.

With regard to sentencing, the record reflects that the circuit court properly exercised its discretion in considering proper and relevant sentencing objectives and factors, including in its analysis of whether to allow eligibility for extended supervision. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197; *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76; *State v. Barbeau*, 2016 WI App 51, ¶18, 370 Wis. 2d 736, 883 N.W.2d 520 (“[W]hen an offender should first be eligible to seek release on extended supervision is governed by the same factors that govern a sentencing decision[.]”). Furthermore, Bonds' sentence complies with the statutory requirement of life imprisonment, and thus is presumed not to be unduly harsh or unconscionable. See *State v. Grindemann*, 2002 WI App 106, ¶32, 255 Wis. 2d 632, 648 N.W.2d 507. Therefore, we agree with appellate counsel's conclusion that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of Bonds' sentence.

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

Upon the foregoing,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Rosen is relieved of further representation of Bonds 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