



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

October 6, 2026

To:

Hon. David C. Swanson
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Leonard D. Kachinsky
Electronic Notice

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

Kenneth D. Wright 695725
Kettle Moraine Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 282
Plymouth, WI 53073-0282

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

2025AP1681-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Kenneth D. Wright (L.C. # 2021CF4389)

Before Donald, C.J., Colón, P.J., and Geenen, J.

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).

Kenneth D. Wright appeals from his judgment of conviction for second-degree reckless homicide and violating a no contact order. His appellate counsel, Attorney Leonard D. Kachinsky, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ Wright 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

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

counsel's report, 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

In October 2021, police responded to reports of a rollover crash in Milwaukee at the intersection of West Capitol Drive and North Green Bay Avenue. A passenger in the vehicle, Jamera Doyle, had been ejected from the vehicle and then pinned underneath it. She was pronounced dead at the scene.

The driver of the vehicle, Wright, told officers that he had swerved to avoid a vehicle that had pulled out in front of him. However, accident reconstruction and airbag data reflected that Wright's vehicle was traveling in a straight line, at approximately eighty-three miles per hour in a thirty mile- per-hour zone, just before the crash.

Wright was arrested and charged with second-degree reckless homicide and operating a vehicle with a suspended license causing death, both as a habitual criminality repeater. He was also charged with violating a no contact order as a habitual criminal repeater; he had previously been convicted of third-degree sexual assault of Doyle and was sentenced to probation, with one of the conditions being no contact with Doyle.

Wright opted to resolve the charges with a plea. In exchange for pleading guilty to the charges of second-degree reckless homicide and violating a no contact order, the charge of operating with a suspended license was dismissed but read in for sentencing purposes. The

habitual criminality repeater enhancers on those counts were also dismissed. Additionally, the State agreed not to issue any further charges relating to the Delta-9 found in Wright's system.²

The circuit court imposed the maximum sentences allowed on these charges: fifteen years of initial confinement followed by ten years of extended supervision for the reckless homicide charge; and a concurrent term of three years of initial confinement followed by three years of extended supervision on the no contact order violation. This no-merit appeal follows.

The no-merit report discusses whether Wright's pleas 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, which are intended to ensure that a defendant's plea is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary. Furthermore, the circuit court confirmed that Wright 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. Hoppe*, 2009 WI 41, ¶32, 317 Wis. 2d 161, 765 N.W.2d 794. We therefore agree with appellate counsel's assessment that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of the validity of Wright's pleas.

The no-merit report also discusses Wright's sentences. 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.*

² During the plea hearing, there was confusion as to whether the State had filed an amended information to include a charge of homicide by intoxicated use of a controlled substance. Ultimately, however, it was determined that this charge had not been added, as no arraignment of that charge had occurred, and the plea proceeded on the original information.

Ziegler, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. In particular, the court observed that Wright had a “pattern of excessive speeding,” stating that his choice to drive recklessly was “not an accident.” The court found these circumstances were “compounded” by the fact that Wright had “blatantly disregarded” the no contact order with Doyle, whom he assaulted when she was fifteen years old, resulting in the birth of a daughter who was now without her mother.

Furthermore, while Wright’s sentences are at the statutory maximums, they are not “so excessive and unusual and so disproportionate to the offense[s] committed as to shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper under the circumstances.” **Ocanas v. State**, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975). We therefore agree with appellate counsel’s conclusion that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of Wright’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 Wright 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 Kachinsky is relieved of further representation of Wright 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