



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

September 1, 2026

To:

Hon. Ellen R. Brostrom
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Olivia Garman
Electronic Notice

Miguel Angel Viramontes-Taylor 522391
Racine Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 900
Sturtevant, WI 53177-0900

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

2025AP1360-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Miguel Angel Viramontes-Taylor
(L.C. # 2022CF3446)

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).

Miguel Angel Viramontes-Taylor appeals a judgment convicting him of one count of physical abuse of a child by recklessly causing great bodily harm. Appellate counsel, Olivia Garman, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ Viramontes-Taylor received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and has not responded. We have independently reviewed the record

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

and the no-merit report as mandated by *Anders*. We conclude that there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

On September 1, 2022, the State charged Viramontes-Taylor with one count of physical abuse of a child—repeated acts causing great bodily harm—and one count of neglecting a child where the consequence is great bodily harm. The complaint alleged that on August 26, 2022, two-year-old S.M. was seriously injured while in Viramontes-Taylor’s care. The injuries included, but were not limited to, bruising all over S.M.’s body, bite marks, and subdural hematomas.

Ultimately, Viramontes-Taylor pled guilty to an amended charge of physical abuse of a child by recklessly causing great bodily harm. The remaining count was dismissed and read in for sentencing. The circuit court conducted a plea colloquy with Viramontes-Taylor and accepted his plea. The court sentenced Viramontes-Taylor to ten years’ initial confinement followed by five years’ extended supervision. The court also granted 381 days of credit for time served. This no-merit appeal follows.

Appellate counsel’s no-merit report addresses two issues: (1) whether Viramontes-Taylor’s plea was knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; and (2) whether the circuit court properly exercised its sentencing discretion.

With regard to Viramontes-Taylor’s guilty plea, our review of the record—including the plea questionnaire/waiver of rights form, the addendum, the jury instruction, and the plea hearing transcript—confirms that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking guilty pleas, pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 971.08, *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 261-62, 389 N.W.2d 12

(1986), and *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. These obligations exist specifically to help ensure the validity of any plea. We thus agree with appellate counsel's conclusion in the no-merit report that there is no arguable merit to seeking plea withdrawal based on a claim that Viramontes-Taylor's plea was anything other than knowing, intelligent, and voluntary.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing decision, we note that sentencing is a matter for the circuit court's discretion. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. At sentencing, a court must consider the principal objectives of sentencing, including the protection of the community, the punishment and rehabilitation of the defendant, and deterrence to others. *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. It must also determine which objective or objectives are of greatest importance. *Gallion*, 270 Wis. 2d 535, ¶41. In seeking to fulfill the sentencing objectives, the court should consider several primary factors, including the gravity of the offense, the character of the offender, and the protection of the public, and it may consider additional factors. *State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695. The weight to be given to each factor is committed to the court's discretion. *Id.* Our review of the record confirms that the circuit court appropriately considered the relevant sentencing objectives and factors, focusing particularly on the gravity of the offense. The resulting sentence was within the potential maximum authorized by law, see *State v. Scaccio*, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622 N.W.2d 449, and is not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment, see *Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

Our independent review of the record reveals no other potential issues of arguable merit.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Olivia Garman is relieved of further representation of Miguel Angel Viramontes-Taylor 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