



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 15, 2026

To:

Hon. Mark A. Sanders
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Timothy C. Drewa
Electronic Notice

Pamela Moorshead
Electronic Notice

Mharquelle Q. Dixon 633293
Green Bay Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 19033
Green Bay, WI 54307-9033

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

2025AP585-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Mharquelle Q. Dixon (L.C. # 2021CF1631)

Before Colón, P.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).

Mharquelle Q. Dixon appeals from his judgment of conviction for two counts of first-degree reckless homicide using a dangerous weapon. His appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ Dixon 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 April 2021, Dixon was charged in the shooting deaths of Starcey Chatman and Keondre Scott. Chatman was discovered deceased inside his vehicle at approximately 11:00 p.m. by a person in the neighborhood where the vehicle was parked. That witness stated he first noticed the vehicle that afternoon, and that he thought the person inside was sleeping.

Police had responded earlier that same day to a shooting at an auto repair shop a short distance away from where Chatman was eventually found. Police learned that Scott had been shot in his vehicle, a white Infiniti, while it was being repaired. The mechanic who was working on Scott's car stated Scott was approached by a male, later identified as Dixon, who wanted to speak with Scott. The two got into Scott's vehicle, and the mechanic heard two gunshots from inside the vehicle. He then saw Scott's girlfriend, who had also been inside the vehicle, get out and run away, with Dixon chasing her and shooting at her. She suffered a gunshot wound to her upper thigh.

Shortly after the Scott shooting, Dixon was arrested at a grocery store without incident. He admitted to shooting Chatman, his uncle, after he saw Chatman reach under his seat, stating that he believed "his family was plotting to kill him." After fleeing from that scene, Dixon thought a white Infiniti, which he believed to be his cousin's vehicle, was following him. When he approached Scott's vehicle, he said he did not believe it was the same vehicle that was "chasing" him, but he claimed Scott was armed and told him to get into the car. Dixon said they talked for several minutes, and then Scott pointed his gun at Dixon, so Dixon felt he had to shoot him. He stated he chased Scott's girlfriend because "she provoked the incident." However, the

girlfriend told police the conversation between Scott and Dixon was not “aggressive or heated,” but rather that they were simply talking when she suddenly heard gunshots.

Dixon was charged with two counts of first-degree reckless homicide using a dangerous weapon; one count of first-degree reckless injury using a dangerous weapon; possession of a firearm by an adjudicated delinquent; and felony bail jumping. Defense counsel raised the issue of his competency, and he was initially found to be not competent to proceed but likely to regain competency. He was transported to Mendota Mental Health Institute, but after further evaluation, he was determined to be competent. The psychologist who examined him testified that Dixon has behavioral issues, engaging in “a variety of disruptive, aggressive, defiant, [and] oppositional behaviors,” as opposed to mental illness. The doctor further opined that Dixon was malingering with the mental illness symptoms he displayed, in a “gross exaggeration of psychological or cognitive impairments.” The circuit court found Dixon was competent to proceed.

Dixon opted to resolve the matter with a plea. In return for pleading guilty to the two first-degree reckless homicide charges, the other charges were dismissed but read in for sentencing purposes.² The circuit court imposed consecutive sentences totaling 45 years of initial confinement followed by 25 years of extended supervision. This no-merit appeal follows.

² An additional count of possession of a firearm by an adjudicated delinquent was added in an amended information, and was among the charges that were dismissed but read in for sentencing purposes. Two charges from another matter—another count of possession of a firearm by an adjudicated delinquent and carrying a concealed weapon—were also dismissed but read in as part of the plea agreement.

In the no-merit report, appellate counsel addresses two issues: whether there would be arguable merit to appealing the validity of Dixon’s pleas; and whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion in sentencing Dixon. 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 demonstrated 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 court confirmed that Dixon signed and understood the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, which further demonstrates that Dixon’s 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 Dixon’s pleas.

With regard to sentencing, the record reflects that the circuit court properly exercised its discretion in considering proper and relevant sentencing objectives and factors. 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. The court described the shootings as “cold[-]blooded, brutal, and terrible.” It observed Dixon’s age—he was 19 at the time of the shootings—but also referenced his extensive juvenile record, which began at age 12. Furthermore, the court noted

the psychologist's opinion that Dixon was malingering, stating it "wholly suggests a certain degree of manipulation" on Dixon's part.

Additionally, Dixon's sentences are within the statutory maximums, and thus are 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. We therefore agree with appellate counsel's conclusion that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of Dixon's sentences.

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 Dixon further in this appeal.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Timothy C. Drewa and Attorney Pamela Moorshead are relieved of further representation of Dixon 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