



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 III

July 1, 2025

To:

Hon. John F. Manydeeds
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Kathleen A. Lindgren
Electronic Notice

Cherie Norberg
Clerk of Circuit Court
Eau Claire County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Jeremias C. Haasnoot 412034
New Lisbon Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 2000
New Lisbon, WI 53950-2000

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

2025AP291-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Jeremias C. Haasnoot
(L. C. No. 2022CF1320)

Before Stark, P.J., Hruz, and Gill, 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).

Counsel for Jeremias C. Haasnoot has filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24),¹ concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Haasnoot's convictions for two counts of delivery of methamphetamine. Haasnoot was informed of his right to file a response to the no-merit report, but he has not responded. Upon our independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), we conclude that there is no

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

arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment of conviction. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

The State charged Haasnoot with one count of delivery of methamphetamine (less than or equal to three grams), one count of delivery of methamphetamine (more than three grams but not more than ten grams), and one count of maintaining a drug trafficking place, all three counts as second or subsequent offenses and with the repeater enhancer. The criminal complaint alleged that Haasnoot sold methamphetamine to a confidential informant during two separate controlled buys, both of which took place at Haasnoot's residence.

The parties reached a plea agreement, which provided that Haasnoot would enter guilty or no-contest pleas to the two delivery of methamphetamine charges, without any enhancers, and the charge of maintaining a drug trafficking place would be dismissed and read in. The plea agreement further provided that the parties would request a presentence investigation report (PSI); that the State would not recommend sentences consecutive to Haasnoot's sentences in any other cases unless the PSI made that recommendation; that the parties would otherwise be free to argue at sentencing; and that the defense could commission an alternative PSI.²

Following a plea colloquy, supplemented by a signed plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, the circuit court accepted Haasnoot's no-contest pleas, finding that they were knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered. Haasnoot agreed that the facts alleged in the

² The plea agreement also provided that Haasnoot would enter guilty or no-contest pleas to three charges in a second case (Eau Claire County Case No. 2023CF39); that three additional charges in that case would be dismissed and read in; and that the parties would make a joint sentence recommendation in that case of court costs. The circuit court accepted Haasnoot's no-contest pleas in Case No. 2023CF39 and followed the parties' joint sentence recommendation in that case. Haasnoot's convictions in Case No. 2023CF39 are not at issue in this no-merit appeal, and we therefore do not address them further.

criminal complaint provided an adequate factual basis for his pleas, and the court found that an adequate factual basis existed.

The circuit court ordered a PSI, and the defense commissioned an alternative PSI. At Haasnoot's sentencing hearing, the State made its sentencing recommendation, which was consistent with the terms of the plea agreement. The defense then made its recommendation, and Haasnoot exercised his right of allocution.

During its sentencing remarks, the circuit court addressed the need to protect the public, Haasnoot's character, his rehabilitative needs, and the gravity of the offenses. The court then imposed concurrent sentences totaling ten years' initial confinement followed by five years' extended supervision.³ With the parties' agreement, the court awarded Haasnoot 285 days of sentence credit. In addition, the court made Haasnoot eligible for the Challenge Incarceration Program and the Substance Abuse Program.

The no-merit report addresses: (1) whether Haasnoot's no-contest pleas were knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; and (2) whether the circuit court erroneously exercised its sentencing discretion. Having independently reviewed the record, we agree with counsel's description, analysis, and conclusion that these potential issues lack arguable merit, and we therefore do not address them further.

³ At Haasnoot's sentencing hearing, the circuit court also imposed sentence on three additional charges in Eau Claire County Case Nos. 2021CF386 and 2021CF488 following the revocation of Haasnoot's probation in those cases. Haasnoot's sentences in Case Nos. 2021CF386 and 2021CF488 are the subject of separate no-merit appeals, and we therefore do not address them further here.

Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathleen A. Lindgren is relieved of further representation of Jeremias C. Haasnoot 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