



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 I**

November 18, 2025

To:

Hon. Mark A. Sanders  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Jill Marie Skwor  
Electronic Notice

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

Donnell Ragsdale 723259  
Stanley Correctional Inst.  
100 Corrections Dr.  
Stanley, WI 54768

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

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

---

2024AP2217-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Donnell Ragsdale (L.C. # 2022CF3785)

Before Colón, P.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).**

Donnell Ragsdale appeals his judgment of conviction for second-degree reckless homicide. His appellate counsel, Attorney Jill Marie Skwor, filed a no-merit report pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).<sup>1</sup> Ragsdale was advised of his right to file a response, but he did not do so. Upon this court's independent

---

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

review of the record as mandated by *Anders*, and counsel's report, we conclude there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm.

Ragsdale was charged in September 2022 in the shooting death of his girlfriend, O.W., at their residence. Ragsdale told police the two had been arguing, and O.W. picked up a revolver. She then sat down on the bed, and Ragsdale attempted to take the gun away from her. They struggled, and the gun went off, shooting O.W. in the head. O.W.'s nine-year-old son was in the home when the shooting occurred. Ragsdale was charged with second-degree reckless homicide.

Ragsdale opted to resolve the charge with a plea. In exchange for his plea in this case, charges in a separate case—battery to a police officer and attempt to disarm a police officer, relating to an incident at the hospital after O.W. was shot—were dismissed but read in for sentencing purposes. The circuit court imposed a sentence of 14 years of initial confinement followed by 9 years of extended supervision. Additionally, Ragsdale stipulated to restitution in the amount of \$8,600 for funeral expenses for O.W. This no-merit appeal follows.

In the no-merit report, appellate counsel addresses two issues: whether there would be arguable merit to appealing the validity of Ragsdale's plea; and whether there would be arguable merit to a claim that the circuit court erroneously exercised its discretion in sentencing Ragsdale. We agree with appellate counsel's analysis that there would be no arguable merit to an appeal of either of these issues.

A plea is not constitutionally valid if it is not knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis.2d 246, 257, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986). This may be established if the requirements set forth in WIS. STAT. § 971.08 and *Bangert* are not met during

the plea colloquy by the circuit court. *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶¶23, 34-35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906.

The record here reflects that the plea colloquy by the circuit court complied with these requirements. Furthermore, the circuit court confirmed that Ragsdale signed and understood the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, which further demonstrates that Ragsdale's plea was knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered. See *State v. Moederndorfer*, 141 Wis. 2d 823, 827, 416 N.W.2d 627 (Ct. App. 1987). We therefore agree with appellate counsel's assessment that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of the validity of Ragsdale's plea.

With regard to sentencing, 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. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. In its analysis, the court observed that Ragsdale had no prior convictions; however, there was a history of domestic abuse between he and O.W. The court also pointed out that O.W.'s son was in the house when she was shot. Furthermore, at the sentencing hearing, the State introduced footage from the responding officers' body cameras, where Ragsdale is heard saying that O.W. never pointed the gun at him, and that he knew O.W. "wasn't going to shoot," indicating that this was not self defense. Rather, it appeared that Ragsdale was angry that O.W. had picked up the gun, as he described her as being "uppity." The court found this to be an "extremely aggravated circumstance."

Nevertheless, Ragsdale's sentence is within the statutory maximum, and is therefore presumed not to be unduly harsh or unconscionable. See *State v. Grindemann*, 2002 WI App

106, ¶32, 255 Wis. 2d 632, 648 N.W.2d 507. Therefore, we agree with appellate counsel's conclusion that there would be no arguable merit to a challenge of Ragsdale's sentence.

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 Ragsdale further in this appeal.

For all the foregoing reasons,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Jill Marie Skwor is relieved of further representation of Ragsdale 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*