



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 IV

January 15, 2026

To:

Hon. Troy L. Nielsen
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Yvette Kienert
Clerk of Circuit Court
Waupaca County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Thomas J. Erickson
Electronic Notice

Alexis A. Dahl 566708
Taycheedah Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 3100
Fond du Lac, WI 54936-3100

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

2024AP2560-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Alexis A. Dahl (L.C. # 2020CF123)

Before Graham, P.J., Blanchard, and Taylor, 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).

Attorney Thomas J. Erickson, as appointed counsel for Alexis A. Dahl, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2019-20)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel provided Dahl with a copy of the report, and both counsel and this court advised Dahl of her right to file a response. Dahl has not responded. We conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21. After our independent

¹ All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2019-20 version.

review of the record, we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal.

In Waupaca County Case No. 2020CF123, the State charged Dahl with nine crimes based on Dahl's treatment of seven children in her care aged six years and under. These included two counts of physical abuse causing great bodily harm, which were based on severe burns sustained by Dahl's three-year-old twin stepchildren, and seven counts of neglect, based on Dahl's failure to care for these stepchildren and her five biological children. Dahl also faced charges in several other cases stemming from a domestic abuse situation, theft, and drug possession. *See* Waupaca County Case Nos. 2021CF384, 2022CF6, 2022CF126. Dahl pled guilty to one count of intentional physical abuse of a child causing great bodily harm, one count of physical abuse of a child recklessly causing great harm, and one count of possession of methamphetamine in exchange for all other pending counts being dismissed and read in.

Dahl faced a maximum sentence of forty years of incarceration on the charge of intentionally causing harm (count one) and fifteen years on the charge of recklessly causing harm (count two). *See* WIS. STAT. §§ 948.03; 939.50(3). The circuit court imposed a sentence consisting of six years of confinement and five years of extended supervision on count two, to be served concurrently with sentences of three years of confinement and three years of extended supervision on count one and one year in the county jail on the drug possession charge in 2022CF6.

The no-merit report addresses whether Dahl's pleas were entered knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently. The plea colloquy sufficiently complied with the requirements of *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906, and WIS. STAT. § 971.08 relating

to the nature of the charges, the rights Dahl was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the pleas. There is no arguable merit to an appeal based on Dahl's pleas.

The no-merit report also addresses Dahl's sentences. As explained in the no-merit report, the sentences are below the legal maximum. As to discretionary issues, the standards for the circuit court and this court are well-established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Gallion*, 2004 WI 42, ¶¶17-51, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. In this case, the court considered appropriate factors, did not consider improper factors, and reached a reasonable result. There is no arguable merit to an appeal related to sentencing.

Our independent review of the record reveals that, on multiple occasions, Dahl alleged to the circuit court that she was not informed of her **Miranda** rights prior to questioning by the police.² The admissibility of any statement Dahl made to law enforcement is not reviewable under WIS. STAT. § 971.31(10) because Dahl did not file a motion to suppress evidence obtained during the police questioning, and review under § 971.31(10) is available only when the circuit court has denied a suppression motion. The only context in which Dahl potentially could raise the issue of the alleged **Miranda** violation would be within the context of a claim for ineffective assistance of trial counsel, if there were sufficient facts to support the following: that a **Miranda** violation could have been shown at a suppression hearing; that trial counsel failed to properly advise Dahl of the potential that she could have prevailed at a suppression hearing on that basis; and that if Dahl had prevailed on such a suppression motion, she would not have entered a guilty

² **Miranda v. Arizona**, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

plea. *See State v. Bentley*, 201 Wis. 2d 303, 311-14, 548 N.W.2d 50 (1996). Here, Dahl would not be able to make the final showing. This is because Dahl's statements to police, which are summarized in the complaint, were not incriminating; to the contrary, she offered explanations for her stepchildren's injuries that (although inconsistent with medical records) were exculpatory. Accordingly, a successful motion to suppress would have no bearing on the strength of the State's case or the decision to enter pleas, and a claim of ineffective assistance based on failure to file such a motion would have no arguable merit.

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

Therefore,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Erickson is relieved of further representation of Dahl 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*