



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](http://www.wicourts.gov)

**DISTRICT II**

November 12, 2025

To:

Hon. Tricia L. Walker  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Michelle Weber  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Fond du Lac County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

Kathleen A. Lindgren  
Electronic Notice

Vince J. Ignoffo #727583  
Racine Correctional Inst.  
P.O. Box 900  
Sturtevant, WI 53177-0900

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

---

2025AP916-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Vince J. Ignoffo (L.C. #2021CF695)

Before Neubauer, P.J., Gundrum, and Grogan, 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).**

Vince J. Ignoffo appeals from a judgment of conviction entered on his plea of no contest to one count of possession of child pornography. His appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24),<sup>1</sup> and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Ignoffo received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and has elected not to do so. Upon consideration of the report and an independent review of the Record, we

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2023-24 version.

conclude there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. We summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

After police found multiple videos and images of young children engaged in sexual conduct during a consensual search of Vince Ignoffo's phone, the State charged him with ten counts of possession of child pornography. The charges involved both male and female victims—all pre-pubescent, who ranged in age from as young one or two to ten to eleven years old.

Pursuant to an agreement with the State, Ignoffo entered a plea of no contest to one count of possession of child pornography. Nine other counts of possession of child pornography were dismissed and read in. The circuit court accepted the plea and found Ignoffo guilty of a sole count. The court ordered a presentence investigation report (PSI) before sentencing and imposed a 15-year prison sentence comprised of 5 years of initial confinement followed by 10 years of extended supervision. This no-merit appeal follows.

We agree with appellate counsel's thorough analysis of the facts and legal principles pertinent to this appeal and, as we now explain, conclude that there would be no arguable basis on which an appeal of Ignoffo's conviction or sentence could rest. First, we see no arguable basis for plea withdrawal. In order to withdraw a plea after sentencing, a defendant either must show that the plea colloquy was defective in a manner that resulted in the defendant entering an unknowing plea or demonstrate some other manifest injustice such as coercion, lack of a factual basis to support the charge, ineffective assistance of counsel, or failure by the prosecutor to fulfill the plea agreement. *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 272-76, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986);

*State v. Krieger*, 163 Wis. 2d 241, 249-51 & n.6, 471 N.W.2d 599 (Ct. App. 1991). There is no evidence of any such defect here.

As we have noted, Ignoffo entered a plea of no contest to one count of possession of child pornography. The circuit court conducted a standard plea colloquy, inquiring into Ignoffo's ability to understand the proceedings, the voluntariness of his plea decision, his understanding of the nature of the charge, the penalty range and other direct consequences of the plea, and the constitutional rights being waived. *See State v. Hoppe*, 2009 WI 41, ¶18, 317 Wis. 2d 161, 765 N.W.2d 794; *Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d at 266-72. The court made sure Ignoffo understood that it would not be bound by any sentencing recommendations. In addition, Ignoffo provided the court with a signed plea questionnaire. Ignoffo signed the form and told the court he understood the information it explains; he is not now claiming otherwise. *See State v. Moederndorfer*, 141 Wis. 2d 823, 827-28, 416 N.W.2d 627 (Ct. App. 1987).

Ignoffo's counsel stated that there was a factual basis for the plea, and there is nothing in the Record or the no-merit report that leads us to conclude otherwise. In addition, Ignoffo indicated satisfaction with his attorney and nothing in our review of the Record would support a claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel. Ignoffo has not alleged any other facts that would give rise to a manifest injustice. Therefore, the plea was valid and operated to waive all nonjurisdictional defects and defenses, aside from any suppression ruling.<sup>2</sup> *See State v. Kelty*, 2006 WI 101, ¶18, 294 Wis. 2d 62, 716 N.W.2d 886.

---

<sup>2</sup> Our review of the Record and the no-merit report indicates that Ignoffo did not file any suppression motions.

There also is no arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court improperly exercised its sentencing discretion. In imposing its sentence, the court explicitly considered the seriousness of the offenses, Ignoffo’s character, and the need to protect the public. *See State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶27, 40-44, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. Ignoffo had the opportunity to comment on the PSI and did so through trial counsel, which filed a three-page document with the court presenting multiple “corrections and additions” to the PSI. Ignoffo also had the opportunity to address the court directly, which he did so prior to the imposition of sentence.

Conviction for possession of child pornography carries a mandatory minimum of 3 years of initial confinement, *see* WIS. STAT. § 939.617, with a maximum sentence of 25 years of imprisonment and a fine of up to a \$100,000, *see* WIS. STAT. §§ 948.12(3)(a). (classifying possession of child pornography as a Class D felony), 939.50(3)(d) (providing maximum penalties for a Class D felony). The circuit court imposed a sentence of 15 years comprised of 5 years of initial confinement followed by 10 years of extended supervision.<sup>3</sup> Under these circumstances, it cannot reasonably be argued that Ignoffo’s sentence is so excessive as to shock public sentiment. *See Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

Upon our independent review of the Record, we see no other arguable basis for reversing the judgment of conviction. *See State v. Allen*, 2010 WI 89, ¶¶81-82, 328 Wis. 2d 1, 786 N.W.2d 124. We conclude that any further appellate proceedings would be wholly frivolous within the meaning of *Anders* and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32.

---

<sup>3</sup> The circuit court also imposed a surcharge of \$500, which is mandatory for each image or each copy of an image associated with the crime. *See* WIS. STAT. § 973.042(2).

Accordingly,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathleen A. Lindgren is relieved from further representing Vince J. Ignoffo in this appeal. *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*