



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 24, 2026

To:

Hon. John F. Manydeeds
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Cherie Norberg
Clerk of Circuit Court
Eau Claire County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Kathilynne Grotelueschen
Electronic Notice

Francis Rivard
Electronic Notice

Ricky A. Doede 719740
Stanley Correctional Institution
100 Corrections Dr.
Stanley, WI 54768

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

2024AP1243-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Ricky A. Doede (L. C. No. 2020CF1524)

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).

Ricky Doede appeals from a judgment convicting him, upon a no-contest plea, of child enticement. Attorney Kathilynne Grotelueschen has filed a no-merit report seeking to withdraw as Doede'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 Doede's plea and sentence. Doede was informed of his right to respond to the no-merit report, but he has not filed a

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

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 Doede with use of a computer to facilitate a child sex crime, child enticement, and attempted sexual assault of a child under 16 years of age. The complaint alleged that Doede exchanged pictures and sexually explicit messages with an undercover officer whom he believed to be a 14-year-old girl, made arrangements to meet the fictitious girl to have sexual intercourse with her, and then drove to the agreed-upon location, where he was arrested.

Doede agreed to plead no contest to the child enticement count in exchange for the dismissal of the other charges as read-in offenses, a joint request for a presentence investigation report (PSI), and the State's agreements not to recommend any prison time unless the PSI recommended prison and to cap any probation recommendation at five years with six months of conditional jail time. The parties clarified on the record that, although they had discussed a plea to a charge of "attempted" child enticement, reduced penalties under the attempt statute did not apply because the child enticement statute already includes attempt. The circuit court accepted Doede's plea after conducting a plea colloquy, reviewing Doede's signed plea questionnaire, and ascertaining that there was a factual basis to support the plea.

The circuit court ordered a PSI and subsequently held a sentencing hearing. After reviewing the PSI prepared by the Department of Corrections and an alternate PSI presented by the defense, the court heard from counsel and gave Doede an opportunity to speak, which he declined. The court discussed factors related to the severity of the offenses and Doede's

character and explained how they related to the court's sentencing goals of protecting the community, punishing Doede, and rehabilitating Doede. The court then sentenced Doede to a bifurcated prison term consisting of two years' initial confinement followed by six years' extended supervision and ordered him to comply with sex offender registration. The court awarded 151 days of sentence credit, as agreed to by the parties.

Upon reviewing the record, we agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that Doede has no arguably meritorious basis to challenge his plea or sentence. The circuit court conducted an adequate plea colloquy, and Doede does not assert that he misunderstood the charges or his 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 sentence imposed was within the maximum available penalties and was 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 Kathilynne Grotelueschen is relieved of any further representation of Ricky Doede 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