



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

December 23, 2025

To:

Hon. Glenn H. Yamahiro
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Angela Conrad Kachelski
Electronic Notice

Rayshawn Hakeem Davis 681182
Racine Correctional Institution
2019 Wisconsin St.
Sturtevant, WI 53177-1829

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

2025AP8-CRNM

State of Wisconsin v. Rayshawn Hakeem Davis
(L.C. # 2021CF500)

Before White, C.J., Colón, P.J., and Donald, J.

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).

Rayshawn Hakeem Davis appeals a judgment convicting him of second-degree sexual assault. Davis's appellate counsel, Angela C. Kachelski, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Davis received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to respond, and has not filed a response. We have independently reviewed the record and the no-merit report as mandated by *Anders*. We

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

conclude that there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm.

On February 10, 2021, the State charged Davis with one count of second-degree sexual assault. According to the complaint, on April 18, 2019, Davis went to the home of a classmate, L.G., and forced her to perform oral sex on him and then forced her to have penis to vagina sexual intercourse without her consent. Davis waived his right to a jury trial and instead had a trial to the court where multiple witnesses, including the victim, law enforcement officers, and Davis, all testified. The trial court found Davis guilty. The court sentenced Davis to seven years of initial confinement and six years of extended supervision. This no-merit report follows.

Appellate counsel's no-merit report addresses multiple issues, including pretrial issues, Davis's waiver of his right to a jury trial, opening statements, witness testimony, Davis's testimony, closing statements, the verdict, and the trial court's sentencing decision. We have independently reviewed the record and agree with counsel's description of each stage of the proceedings.

We note that counsel's no-merit report does not expressly address the sufficiency of the evidence; however, counsel thoroughly describes the witnesses' testimonies. We must affirm the verdict unless the evidence, viewed most favorably to the State and the conviction, is so insufficient in probative value and force, that as a matter of law no reasonable trier of fact could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Poellinger*, 153 Wis. 2d 493, 501, 451 N.W.2d 752 (1990). When acting as fact-finder, the trial court is the ultimate arbiter of witness credibility. *State v. Peppertree Resort Villas, Inc.*, 2002 WI App 207, ¶19, 257 Wis. 2d 421, 651 N.W.2d 345. The trial court acknowledged that this was a "credibility case" and ultimately

found the testimonies supported a guilty verdict. Upon our independent review of the record, we are satisfied that the testimonies of the multiple witnesses, along with the properly-admitted exhibits, are sufficient to support the conviction.

Appellate counsel also addresses whether the trial court erroneously exercised its sentencing discretion. *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. Although the court did not expressly acknowledge the primary sentencing factors, our review of the record satisfies us that the court properly exercised its discretion. The court acknowledged the gravity of the offense, discussed several mitigating factors, and paid particular attention to Davis's background and character. A challenge to the trial court's sentencing decision would lack arguable merit.

Our review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. Accordingly, this court accepts the no-merit report, affirms the judgment, and discharges appellate counsel of the obligation to further represent Davis on appeal. Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Angela C. Kachelski is relieved from further representing Rayshawn Hakeem Davis 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