



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 28, 2025

To:

Hon. John A. Franke
Reserve Judge

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

Timothy D. Rennhack 558768
Stanley Correctional Inst.
100 Corrections Dr.
Stanley, WI 54768

Timothy C. Drewa
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP2032-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Timothy D. Rennhack (L.C. # 2022CF1655)

Before White, C.J., Donald, and Geenen, 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).

Attorney Timothy C. Drewa, as appointed counsel for Timothy D. Rennhack, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel provided Rennhack with a copy of the report, and both counsel and this court advised Rennhack of his right to file a response. Rennhack did not respond. We conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21. After our

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

independent review of the record, we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal.

The State charged Rennhack with the following four crimes: Count 1, possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance (cocaine) in an amount greater than 40 grams; Count 2, fleeing or eluding an officer; Count 3, second-degree recklessly endangering safety; and Count 4, possession of a firearm as a felon as a repeat firearm crime. Pursuant to plea negotiations, the State agreed to amend Count 1 from a quantity greater than 40 grams to a quantity between 15 and 40 grams and to move the circuit court to dismiss and read in Count 2. Counts 3 and 4 would remain as charged. The State additionally agreed to recommend an overall sentence of 10 years of initial confinement.

Rennhack agreed to plead guilty to the amended Count 1, along with Counts 3 and 4.² The circuit court accepted Rennhack's pleas and dismissed Count 2 as a read-in offense. The court then imposed sentences totaling nine years of initial confinement and seven years of extended supervision.³

The circuit court granted the defense's request for 115 days of sentence credit. The court ordered Rennhack eligible for the Challenge Incarceration and Substance Abuse Programs with

² During sentencing, the State struck the repeat-firearm-crime enhancer given that the mandatory minimum no longer applied. *See* WIS. STAT. § 939.6195(3) (2021-22) (providing that the provisions of § 939.6195 do not apply to sentences imposed after July 1, 2022).

³ On Count 1, the circuit imposed nine years of initial confinement and seven years of extended supervision. On Counts 3 and 4, the court imposed sentences of five years of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision, to be served concurrently to each other and to Count 1.

regard to Count 1, but not for Counts 3 and 4. This meant that Rennhack would first be eligible for programming after completing five years of initial confinement.

The no-merit report addresses whether Rennhack's pleas were entered knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently. The plea colloquy sufficiently complied with the requirements of *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906, and WIS. STAT. § 971.08 relating to the nature of the charges, the rights Rennhack was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the pleas. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report also addresses Rennhack's sentences. The sentences are within the legal maximums. As to discretionary issues, the standards for the circuit court and this court are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶17-51, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. In this case, the court considered appropriate factors, did not consider improper factors, and reached a reasonable result. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for 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 is relieved of further representation of Rennhack 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