



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

September 16, 2025

To:

Hon. Vincent R. Biskupic
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Eliot M. Held
Electronic Notice

Barb Bocik
Clerk of Circuit Court
Outagamie County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Jason Lee Edmonson 530994
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:

2023AP1899

State of Wisconsin v. Jason Lee Edmonson
(L. C. No. 2007CF50)

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).

Jason Lee Edmonson appeals an order denying his petition for a writ of coram nobis. The issues presented are: (1) whether the circuit court properly denied Edmonson's petition; and (2) whether we should issue sanctions against Edmonson pursuant to *State v. Casteel*, 2001 WI App 188, ¶25, 247 Wis. 2d 451, 634 N.W.2d 338. Based upon our review of the briefs and record, we conclude at conference that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21 (2023-24).¹ We affirm and order *Casteel* sanctions.

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

In 2009, a jury found Edmonson guilty of one count of first-degree sexual assault of a child under the age of 13, one count of felony bail jumping, and one count of misdemeanor bail jumping. The circuit court imposed consecutive sentences totaling 25 years of initial confinement, followed by 23 years of extended supervision, and six months in jail.

On direct appeal, we accepted appointed appellate counsel's no-merit report and summarily affirmed the judgment. *State v. Edmonson*, No. 2010AP1689-CRNM, unpublished op. and order (WI App Sept. 29, 2011). In our lengthy decision, we addressed the sufficiency of the evidence, various evidentiary rulings, and challenges to Edmonson's sentence, agreeing with counsel's conclusion that the issues lacked arguable merit. We also addressed and rejected the claims Edmonson raised in his response to the no-merit report: that there was prosecutorial misconduct; that his Fourth Amendment rights were violated; and that he received ineffective assistance of counsel.

Over the next decade, Edmonson initiated over 20 appellate actions related to his conviction, which are set forth in detail in our decision denying Edmonson's petition for a writ of habeas corpus dated November 4, 2021. See *Edmonson v. Jess*, No. 2021AP214-W, unpublished op. and order (WI App Nov. 4, 2021). In that opinion, we rejected Edmonson's claims as procedurally barred, explaining that he was prohibited from continuing to assert claims that were finally adjudicated against him, or which could have been previously raised. We also noted that this court previously concluded that Edmonson's claims were procedurally barred.

On July 5, 2023, Edmonson filed the current petition for a writ of coram nobis. On September 22, 2023, the circuit court denied the petition because Edmonson remained in

custody, and thus was ineligible for the relief he sought. The court also observed that, he raised only legal issues that had been previously decided. Edmonson appeals from that order.

A petition for a writ of coram nobis is a very narrow common law remedy that allows a circuit court to correct an unknown error of fact that does not appear in the record and which would have prevented the judgment from being entered. *State ex rel. Patel v. State*, 2012 WI App 117, ¶¶12-13, 344 Wis. 2d 405, 824 N.W.2d 862. It is not a vehicle for legal challenges. *Jessen v. State*, 95 Wis. 2d 207, 214, 290 N.W.2d 685 (1980). In addition, the petitioner “must establish that no other remedy is available.” *State v. Heimermann*, 205 Wis. 2d 376, 384, 556 N.W.2d 756 (Ct. App. 1996). Therefore, a petitioner who is still in custody on the challenged conviction may not invoke coram nobis because WIS. STAT. § 974.06 supplies an adequate alternative remedy. *Heimermann*, 205 Wis. 2d at 384.

Edmonson’s petition is unavailing. Edmonson argues that his Fourth Amendment rights were violated, that he received ineffective assistance of counsel, that the State violated his right to due process by failing to preserve potentially exculpatory evidence, and that his sentence was not properly imposed. These claims involve legal issues that may not be raised by a petition for a writ of coram nobis. Moreover, Edmonson remains in custody on the conviction he challenges, and thus he has not shown that coram nobis is the only remedy available to him. Beyond these procedural flaws in his petition, as a substantive matter, Edmonson raises issues that have already been adjudicated and rejected in prior appeals and, thus, these claims are procedurally barred. *See State v. Escalona-Naranjo*, 185 Wis. 2d 168, 184-86, 517 N.W.2d 157 (1994).

The State asks this court to impose sanctions against Edmonson for filing what we previously characterized as an “unending succession” of repetitive, meritless actions challenging his conviction. See *Casteel*, 247 Wis. 2d, at ¶¶23-25. *Casteel* authorizes prospective filing restrictions when a litigant’s serial meritless filings impede the court’s functioning. *Id.*, ¶23. “Frivolous actions hinder a court’s ability to function efficiently and effectively and to fairly administer justice to litigants who have brought nonfrivolous actions.” *Id.* “A court may exercise its inherent power to ensure that it ‘functions efficiently and effectively to provide the fair administration of justice,’ and to control its docket with economy of time and effort.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

We conclude that we have arrived at the point where prospective filing restrictions are warranted to ensure the efficient and effective administration of justice for all litigants before this court.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed. WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that due to Edmonson’s repetitive litigation of procedurally barred issues relating to Outagamie County Circuit Court Case No. 2007CF50, Edmonson shall be required to submit an affidavit to this court each and every time he attempts to initiate a new appeal or writ relating to that case. The affidavit shall include: (1) a copy of the circuit court’s written decision that he seeks to appeal; (2) a statement setting forth the specific grounds upon which this court could grant relief; (3) a statement showing how the issues sought to be raised differ from issues raised and previously adjudicated; and (4) a statement explaining why any new

claims are not barred by *Escalona-Naranjo*, 185 Wis. 2d, at 184-86. If this affidavit or any additional information we may request upon reviewing the affidavit does not demonstrate that Edmonson has stated a claim upon which relief could be granted that is not procedurally barred, we will refuse to accept the filing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this summary disposition order will not be published.

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Court of Appeals