



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 III

February 17, 2026

To:

Hon. Thomas J. Walsh
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

John VanderLeest
Clerk of Circuit Court
Brown County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Christina C. Starner
Electronic Notice

Anne Lisette Graveen 603174
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:

2024AP948-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Anne Lisette Graveen
(L. C. No. 2020CF1351)

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).

Anne Graveen appeals from a judgment convicting her, upon her no-contest pleas, of conspiracy to commit armed robbery and felony bail jumping. Attorney Christina Starner has filed a no-merit report seeking to withdraw as Graveen's appellate counsel. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24).¹ The no-merit report sets forth the procedural history of the case and addresses the validity of Graveen's pleas and sentences. Graveen was informed of her right to

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

respond to the no-merit report, but she has not filed a response. Having independently reviewed the entire record as mandated by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), we conclude that there are no arguably meritorious issues for appeal. Therefore, counsel shall be allowed to withdraw, and the judgment of conviction will be summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

The State charged Graveen with first-degree intentional homicide as a party to the crime, conspiracy to commit armed robbery, and three counts of felony bail jumping. The charges were based upon allegations that, while released on bail on other charges, Graveen formed a plan with her brother, Clarence, and a cousin, Waylon Wayman, to rob Graveen's former boyfriend, Codie Schultz, because Schultz had previously stolen from both Graveen and Wayman. Wayman shot and killed Schultz during the robbery.

Graveen agreed to plead no contest to conspiracy to commit armed robbery and one count of bail jumping in exchange for the dismissal of the other three charges as read-in offenses, with both parties free to argue at sentencing. The circuit court accepted Graveen's pleas and dismissed the other charges after conducting a plea colloquy, reviewing Graveen's signed plea questionnaire, and ascertaining that there was a factual basis to support the pleas.

The circuit court ordered a presentence investigation report (PSI) and subsequently held a sentencing hearing. After reviewing the PSI, victim impact statements, and letters submitted to the court, the court heard from counsel, the victim's mother, and Graveen. The court then discussed factors related to the severity of the offenses and Graveen's character, and it explained how they related to the court's sentencing goals of punishment, protection of the public, and rehabilitation. The court sentenced Graveen to 12 years' initial confinement followed by

10 years' extended supervision on the conspiracy to commit armed robbery count and 1 year of initial confinement followed by 2 years' extended supervision on the bail jumping count, consecutive to the conspiracy count.

Upon reviewing the record, we agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that Graveen has no arguably meritorious basis to challenge her pleas or sentences. The circuit court conducted an adequate plea colloquy, and Graveen does not assert that she misunderstood the charges or her rights. *See* WIS. STAT. § 971.08(1)(a); *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986) (discussing the requirements for plea colloquies). The sentences imposed were within the maximum available penalties and were not unduly harsh, given the circumstances of the case. *See State v. Grindemann*, 2002 WI App 106, ¶31, 255 Wis. 2d 632, 648 N.W.2d 507 (explaining that a sentence may be considered unduly harsh or unconscionable only when it is "so excessive and unusual and so disproportionate to the offense committed as to shock public sentiment and violate the judgment of reasonable people concerning what is right and proper under the circumstances" (citation omitted)).

Our independent review of the record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. We conclude that any further appellate proceedings would be wholly frivolous within the meaning of *Anders*. Accordingly, counsel shall be allowed to withdraw, and the judgment of conviction will be summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Upon the foregoing,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Christina Starner is relieved of any further representation of Anne Graveen in this matter pursuant to 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