



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

August 19, 2026

To:

Hon. George A. Limbeck
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Hector Salim Al-Homsi
Electronic Notice

Chris Koenig
Clerk of Circuit Court
Sheboygan County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Angela Conrad Kachelski
Electronic Notice

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

2025AP861-CR

State of Wisconsin v. Long Vang (L.C. #2019CF428)

Before Lazar P.J., Gundrum, and Grogan, 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).

Long Vang appeals from a judgment of conviction, entered after a jury trial, for two counts of first-degree sexual assault—sexual contact with a person under the age of 13. Vang contends there was insufficient evidence to support his convictions. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).¹ We affirm.

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

BACKGROUND

In 2023, Vang was charged with two counts of first-degree sexual assault, stemming from allegations that, in 2019, he touched the vaginas of sisters six-year-old Ava and five-year-old Nina² during a party at a relative's home. At Vang's trial, the following relevant evidence was presented.

Ava testified that while playing with water balloons in the kitchen at the party with Nina and a cousin, Vang touched her "private" with his hand from behind, under her sundress. She added that when Vang touched her on her private area, he moved his hand around on that area, causing her pain. Ava saw Vang touch Nina but did not see exactly where he touched her. Ava further testified that she reported the assault to her parents in the car after leaving the party.

Nina also testified that while she was playing with water balloons in the kitchen, a man touched, either over or under her clothing, her body part that she uses to "pee," and she explained that this made her feel angry and scared because nobody had touched her there before.

The girls' father testified that when he entered the kitchen, he saw Vang in a secluded corner of the kitchen with Ava. Vang's hands were over Ava's shoulders from behind, and Ava had an expression of discomfort and confusion that the father had never seen before. When Ava attempted to step away from Vang, Vang pulled her back, and she only "broke out" when her father called for her. The father, his wife (the girls' mother), and the girls left the party, and soon after they got into their car, the girls acknowledged that Vang had touched them. The father and

² Ava and Nina are pseudonyms.

mother returned to the party and confronted Vang, who denied any wrongdoing and claimed he was “just checking to see if [the girls] were wet.”

The girls’ mother testified that both girls told her that Vang had touched their “kunung,” meaning vagina and that Vang also claimed he was “just tr[ying] to catch them because they were falling.”

Vang did not testify but made several statements to law enforcement. Officer Michael Wynveen confirmed during his testimony that Vang indicated to him that one of the girls fell, so he reached under her to pick her up. Officer Brandon Kehoe testified that Vang “acknowledged that he would have had contact with the middle part of the vagina, and then he also put his hands a little bit lower than the middle” “[u]nder the underwear.” Kehoe confirmed that Vang had told him “that four of [Vang’s] fingers would have then gone in [under the underwear] and would have touched that area.”

Former Officer Hang Lor testified that Vang told him the girls fell multiple times and he was just picking them up, but that Vang never mentioned he was checking if they were wet. When Lor asked Vang whether it was “possible his fingers went on the inside of one of the girls as he was picking her up,” Vang said it was “possible.”

Vang’s defense at trial was that he did not touch the girls with the intent of obtaining sexual arousal or gratification, but the jury found him guilty on both counts. Following his sentencing, he now appeals.

DISCUSSION

On appeal, Vang contends the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions because there is no evidence he touched the girls’ vaginas for the purpose of sexual arousal or gratification, and thus there was insufficient evidence that he had “sexual contact” with them, as required for a conviction. He does not persuade.

We are guided by our supreme court’s holding that:

in reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence to support a conviction, an appellate court may not substitute its judgment for that of the trier of fact unless the evidence, viewed most favorably to the state and the conviction, is so lacking in probative value and force that no trier of fact, acting reasonably, could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If any possibility exists that the trier of fact could have drawn the appropriate inferences from the evidence adduced at trial to find the requisite guilt, an appellate court may not overturn a verdict even if it believes that the trier of fact should not have found guilt based on the evidence before it.

State v. Poellinger, 153 Wis. 2d 493, 507, 451 N.W.2d 752 (1990). Moreover, “when faced with a record of historical facts which supports more than one inference, an appellate court must accept and follow the inference drawn by the trier of fact unless the evidence on which that inference is based is incredible as a matter of law.” *Id.* at 506-07. Witness credibility and the weight given to evidence is for the trier of fact to determine. *Id.* at 504.

As relevant here, the trial court instructed the jury that the State was required to prove Vang had sexual contact with the girls and that “[s]exual contact” means an “intentional touching [of the vagina], whether direct or through clothing ... for the purpose of sexually degrading or sexually humiliating [the girls] or sexually arousing or gratifying [Vang].” See WIS. STAT. § 948.01(5)(a); WIS. STAT. § 948.02(1)(e); WIS JI—CRIMINAL 2102E. The jury found that the element of sexual contact was satisfied, and we conclude that the evidence supports the jury’s finding.

Viewing the evidence most favorably to the State, as we must, we are satisfied that a “trier of fact, acting reasonably, could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt,” based on the testimony presented and the reasonable inferences therefrom. *See State v. Smith*, 2012 WI 91, ¶24, 342 Wis. 2d 710, 817 N.W.2d 410; *Poellinger*, 153 Wis. 2d at 506-07. To begin, Ava and Nina both testified that Vang touched their vaginas³ with his hand when they were in the kitchen. Vang also admitted to touching the girls’ vaginas. In his interviews with law enforcement, Vang acknowledged that it was possible his fingers went “inside one of the girls,” that his fingers touched the vagina of one of the girls *under* her underwear, and that his DNA may be on one of the girl’s underwear and vagina.

While Vang argues that he had a reason other than sexual arousal or gratification to touch the girls—to see if they were wet and/or to stop them from falling—the jury was not required to accept his alternative explanations. To begin, his statements were inconsistent. He initially claimed he touched the girls’ vaginas to determine whether their clothing was wet, but he also told the girls’ parents and law enforcement that he touched the girls’ vaginas while trying to stop them from falling or to pick them up because they had fallen. The jury clearly did not find Vang’s alternative explanation(s) credible. *See State v. Below*, 2011 WI App 64, ¶3, 333 Wis. 2d 690, 799 N.W.2d 95. When more than one reasonable inference can be drawn from the evidence, the inference in favor of the verdict controls. *Smith*, 342 Wis. 2d 710, ¶¶24, 33. Here, the inference that the jury obviously adopted for Vang’s touching of the girls’ vaginas—that he did it for his

³ Ava testified that Vang touched her “private” area and Nina testified that Vang touched her body part that she uses to “pee.”

own sexual arousal or gratification—is the most reasonable inference from the evidence.⁴ There was sufficient evidence in support of the verdicts.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals

⁴ Vang also contends his convictions are suspect because the girls’ “forensic statements may have been tainted” and the convictions were based only on circumstantial evidence, that “there was no direct evidence that Mr. Vang committed the sexual assaults.” To begin, we do not consider these “arguments” as they are insufficiently developed. See *Clean Wis., Inc. v. PSC*, 2005 WI 93, ¶180 n.40, 282 Wis. 2d 250, 700 N.W.2d 768 (“We will not address undeveloped arguments.”). Moreover, Vang is entirely incorrect on the first point, as his convictions were based on the direct evidence of the girls’ testimony that Vang touched their vaginas and Vang’s own admissions of the same.