



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 III**

January 6, 2026

*To:*

Hon. Mark G. Schroeder  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

Barb Bocik  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
Outagamie County Courthouse  
Electronic Notice

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

Kathilynn Grotelueschen  
Electronic Notice

Jay L. Scott 180942  
Redgranite Correctional Institution  
P.O. Box 925  
Redgranite, WI 54970-0925

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

---

2025AP1437-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Jay L. Scott (L. C. No. 2023CF1025)

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).**

Counsel for Jay L. Scott has filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24),<sup>1</sup> concluding that no grounds exist to challenge Scott's convictions for armed carjacking, felony bail jumping, and theft of moveable property (value greater than \$2,500 but not exceeding \$5,000). Scott was informed of his right to file a response to the no-merit report, but he has not responded. Upon our independent review of the record as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that

---

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

could be raised on appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment of conviction. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

According to the criminal complaint, on the evening of October 2, 2023, Scott approached a woman and her four-year-old child in a mall parking lot while brandishing a knife and told the woman to get into her car. Scott then got into the vehicle's driver's seat, stated he wanted money, took the woman's purse and phone, and drove the vehicle to an ATM. The woman was unable to withdraw money from the ATM, and Scott kept driving. While the vehicle was stopped at a red light, the woman opened the door and jumped out of the vehicle with her child. She flagged down a passing motorist, who called 911. Shortly thereafter, law enforcement located and stopped the woman's vehicle, and Scott was identified as the driver. Scott was released on bond in a felony case at the time of these events, and his bond conditions required him not to commit any crimes.

Based on these allegations, the State charged Scott with armed carjacking, kidnapping, forceful abduction of a child, armed robbery, felony bail jumping, and theft of moveable property (value greater than \$2,500 but not exceeding \$5,000). Pursuant to a plea agreement, Scott entered guilty pleas to the charges of armed carjacking, felony bail jumping, and theft of moveable property. In exchange for Scott's pleas, the remaining charges were dismissed and read in for purposes of sentencing, along with the charges in another case. The plea agreement further provided that the parties would jointly request a presentence investigation report and that both sides would be free to argue at sentencing.

Following a plea colloquy, supplemented by a signed plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form, the circuit court accepted Scott's guilty pleas, finding that they were knowingly,

intelligently, and voluntarily entered. Scott's attorney stipulated that the court could rely on the allegations in the criminal complaint as the factual basis for Scott's pleas, and the court found that an adequate factual basis for the pleas existed. The court ultimately imposed concurrent sentences totaling 30 years' initial confinement followed by 10 years' extended supervision.

The no-merit report addresses: (1) whether Scott's pleas were knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered; and (2) whether there are any arguably meritorious grounds to challenge the sentences imposed. This court is satisfied that the no-merit report correctly analyzes the issues raised as being without merit. Accordingly, we will not discuss them further.

Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal.

Therefore,

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

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Attorney Kathilynne Grotelueschen is relieved of further representation of Jay L. Scott 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*