



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**

January 13, 2026

*To:*

Hon. Kori L. Ashley  
Circuit Court Judge  
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling  
Electronic Notice

Olivia Garman  
Electronic Notice

Leandra Brown  
2006 N. 30th Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53208

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

---

2025AP336-CRNM      State of Wisconsin v. Leandra Brown (L.C. # 2023CF242)

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).**

Leandra Brown appeals a judgment, entered upon his guilty pleas, convicting him of two counts of threat of bodily harm to a health care provider. Appellate counsel, Olivia Garman, 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> Brown received a copy of the report, was advised of his right to file a response, and has filed multiple responses. We have independently reviewed the record, the no-merit report, and Brown's responses as mandated by *Anders*. We conclude that there are no

---

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

issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

On January 19, 2023, the State charged Brown with two counts of threat of bodily harm to a health care provider. The complaint alleged that Brown threatened two female health care providers while he was a patient at the Clement J. Zablocki Veterans' Administration Medical Center. The circuit court ordered a competency evaluation. The court adopted the findings of the evaluating professional and found Brown competent to proceed.

Ultimately, Brown agreed to plead guilty to both counts. The circuit court conducted a plea colloquy with Brown and accepted his pleas. The court sentenced Brown to two years of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision on each count, concurrent with each other, but stayed that sentence for three years of probation. The court ordered 124 days of sentence credit if Brown's probation were to be revoked. This no-merit report follows.

Appellate counsel's no-merit report addresses two issues: (1) whether Brown's pleas were knowing, intelligent, and voluntary; and (2) whether the circuit court properly exercised its sentencing discretion.

With regard to Brown's guilty pleas, our review of the record—including the plea questionnaire/waiver of rights form, the addendum, the jury instructions, and the plea hearing transcript—confirms that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking guilty pleas, pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 971.08, *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 261-62, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986), and *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. These obligations exist specifically to help ensure the validity of any plea. We thus agree with appellate counsel's conclusion in the no-merit report that there is no arguable merit to seeking

plea withdrawal based on a claim that Brown's pleas were anything other than knowing, intelligent, and voluntary.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing decision, we note that sentencing is a matter for the circuit court's discretion. *See State v. Gillion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. At sentencing, a court must consider the principal objectives of sentencing, including the protection of the community, the punishment and rehabilitation of the defendant, and deterrence to others. *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. It must also determine which objective or objectives are of greatest importance. *Gillion*, 270 Wis. 2d 535, ¶41. In seeking to fulfill the sentencing objectives, the court should consider several primary factors, including the gravity of the offense, the character of the offender, and the protection of the public, and it may consider additional factors. *State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695. The weight to be given to each factor is committed to the court's discretion. *Id.* Our review of the record confirms that the court appropriately considered the relevant sentencing objectives and factors. The resulting sentence was within the potential maximum authorized by law, *see State v. Scaccio*, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622 N.W.2d 449, and is not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment, *see Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975).

In his responses, Brown contends that the circuit court violated "veteran['s] laws" by prohibiting him from contacting the VA Medical Center as a condition of his probation and that the court failed to explain its reasoning for the prohibition. Contrary to Brown's assertion, the court explained that the prohibition stemmed from Brown's threatening behavior towards two of the female VA staff members. The court informed Brown that he was not prohibited from seeking medical treatment altogether and stated that he could obtain treatment at other medical

facilities. Brown also acknowledged that he was able to obtain treatment at other treatment centers. Accordingly, we disagree with Brown's contention that the circuit court violated any laws when deciding Brown's conditions of probation.

Our independent review of the record reveals no other potential issues of arguable merit.

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Olivia Garman is relieved of further representation of Leandra Brown 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*