



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 I

July 14, 2026

To:

Hon. Michelle A. Havas
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

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

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Kathleen A. Lindgren
Electronic Notice

Keondra A. Timmons 712517
Waupun Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 351
Waupun, WI 53963-0351

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

2025AP202-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Keondra A. Timmons (L.C. # 2022CF4752)

Before Donald, C.J., Geenen, and Petrashek, 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 Kathleen A. Lindgren, as appointed counsel for Keondra A. Timmons, filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel provided Timmons with a copy of the report, and both counsel and

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

this court advised him of his right to file a response. Timmons has not responded.² We conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21. After our independent review of the record, we conclude that there is no arguable merit to any issue that could be raised on appeal.

Timmons was charged with three counts of first-degree reckless injury as a party to a crime and with use of a dangerous weapon. The charges stemmed from a shooting incident that left three victims with gunshot wounds. Included among the victims were a 74-year-old woman who suffered a gunshot wound to her forehead and her 2-year-old great nephew who sustained four gunshot wounds. The woman was pushing the child on a swing at a playground when occupants of a vehicle opened fire in their direction. The third victim suffered a gunshot wound to his back. A witness identified Timmons as the driver of the vehicle.

Timmons pled guilty to the crimes. The circuit court imposed a sentence of 20 years of initial confinement and 10 years of extended supervision on each count, to be served concurrently to each other but consecutively to Timmons' revocation sentence in another case.

The no-merit report addresses whether Timmons' 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

² Counsel informed the court that Timmons had contacted her regarding a potential issue of arguable merit. Per counsel's request, we issued an order staying the no-merit proceedings so that she could confer with Timmons. On May 29, 2026, counsel filed a letter advising that she spoke with Timmons and "[h]e no longer wishes to withdraw the No Merit Report."

relating to the nature of the charges, the rights Timmons was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the plea.³ There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report addresses Timmons' sentence. The sentences are within the legal maximums. 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 this issue.

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

Therefore,

³ We note that instead of utilizing the space allotted on the plea questionnaire and waiver of rights form to state the maximum penalty Timmons faced upon conviction, trial counsel erroneously utilized the space allotted for stating the mandatory minimum penalty. Specifically, the questionnaire contains the following prompt: "I understand that the judge must impose the mandatory minimum penalty, if any. The mandatory minimum penalty I face upon conviction is[.]" Trial counsel's typed response indicates that for each of the counts to which Timmons pled guilty, Timmons faced a maximum fine of \$100,000 and/or maximum incarceration of 20 years of initial incarceration. First, no mandatory minimum penalties applied. Second, no mention is made of the additional ten years of extended supervision that Timmons faced. However, during the plea colloquy, the circuit court went to great lengths to accurately state the maximum penalties and to ensure that Timmons understood the information provided. There would be no arguable merit to pursuing this issue.

Additionally, the form was not signed. The circuit court addressed this omission during the plea colloquy, noting that trial counsel went over the form with Timmons "either [on] Zoom or on the phone," and then electronically filed it with Timmons' permission. Timmons confirmed on the record that if he had been present in the room with trial counsel he would have signed the form. A written plea questionnaire is a tool that the circuit court may use in conducting a plea colloquy, but it is not an essential component of the plea procedure. See *State v. Hoppe*, 2009 WI 41, ¶30, 317 Wis. 2d 161, 765 N.W.2d 794. In this case, the plea colloquy that the circuit court conducted on the record demonstrates that Timmons entered his guilty pleas knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily. See *id.*, ¶31.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathleen A. Lindgren is relieved of further representation of Timmons 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