



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 22, 2026

To:

Hon. Michelle A. Havas
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

Elijah Israel Webb 665915
Drug Abuse Correctional Center (DACC)
4820 Sherman Rd.
P.O. Box 190
Winnebago, WI 54985

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

2024AP1791-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Elijah Israel Webb (L.C. # 2020CF4339)
2024AP1792-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Elijah Israel Webb (L.C. # 2021CF2462)
2024AP1793-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Elijah Israel Webb (L.C. # 2021CF5074)
2024AP1794-CRNM	State of Wisconsin v. Elijah Israel Webb (L.C. # 2022CF4972)

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).

Elijah Israel Webb appeals from his judgments of conviction in these consolidated matters. His appellate counsel, Attorney Timothy C. Drewa, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ Webb received a copy of the report and filed a response. Upon this court's independent review of the

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

record as mandated by **Anders**, counsel's report, and Webb's response, we conclude there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Webb was charged with 22 counts in four separate cases between December 2020 and December 2022, relating to domestic violence incidents with three different victims with whom he had relationships. As part of a plea agreement for all four cases, Webb pled guilty to 12 charges, including battery, disorderly conduct, and bail jumping, most of which included domestic abuse assessments and habitual criminality repeater enhancers. The remaining counts were dismissed but read in for sentencing purposes.

The circuit court imposed concurrent sentences for the counts in each case, but consecutive to any other cases. The sentences totaled eight years of initial confinement followed by eight years of extended supervision. 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 Webb's pleas; and whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion in sentencing Webb. We agree with appellate counsel's analysis that there would be no arguable merit to an appeal of either of these issues.

With regard to Webb's pleas, the no-merit report discusses whether they were knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. The record reflects that the plea colloquy by 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,

¶¶23, 34-35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. Additionally, the circuit court confirmed that Webb signed and understood the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, which further demonstrates that his pleas were 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 Webb’s pleas.

With regard to sentencing, the no-merit report discusses, and 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. In particular, the court noted the “staggering” number of offenses that Webb was charged with.

Furthermore, Webb’s sentences are within the statutory maximums, including the habitual criminality repeater enhancers, and are thus 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 Webb’s sentences.

In his response, Webb states that he did not fully understand the charges against him, and suggests that the plea colloquy was deficient. However, as discussed above, the record demonstrates that the colloquy was not deficient. Indeed, the circuit court provided a thorough and detailed explanation of the charges and penalties for each count in every case, and confirmed Webb’s understanding of them all respectively. The court also established which counts

included a habitual criminality repeater enhancer and explained to Webb the increased penalties he faced as a result, which Webb indicated he understood.

Webb also raises an issue regarding “sentence change[s] several times,” which we construe as a challenge to amendments made to the judgments of conviction. These amendments were the result of clerical errors on the judgments. An amendment to one judgment was ordered by the circuit court to accurately reflect the application of habitual criminality repeater enhancers on two counts, which were inadvertently omitted from the original judgment of conviction. Additionally, appellate counsel filed a postconviction motion seeking to correct two misdemeanor convictions which were mistakenly classified as felonies. Furthermore, the Department of Corrections requested clarification regarding the structure for the concurrent and consecutive sentences, which also resulted in an amended judgment. The amendments, entered to correct these clerical errors, and the clarification for DOC, reflect the intent of the circuit court when it imposed Webb’s sentences.

We therefore conclude that Webb has raised no issues of arguable merit in his response. Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. Accordingly, this court accepts the no-merit report, affirms the convictions, and discharges appellate counsel of the obligation to represent Webb further in these appeals.

Upon the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgments are summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Timothy C. Drewa is relieved of further representation of Webb 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