



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

July 16, 2026

To:

Hon. John M. Wood
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Donald C. Dudley
Electronic Notice

Amanda Nelson
Clerk of Circuit Court
Rock County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

Jonathan W. Baumann 565157
Columbia Correctional Center
2925 Columbia Drive
Portage, WI 53901-0950

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

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

2024AP2527-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Jonathan W. Baumann (L.C. # 2021CF777)

Before Blanchard, Kloppenburg, and Nashold, 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 Donald Dudley, as appointed counsel for Jonathan Baumann, 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 Baumann with a copy of the report, and both counsel and this court advised him of his right to file a response. Baumann has not responded. We conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21. After our

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

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

Baumann pled guilty to one count of resisting an officer, one count of obstructing an officer, and two counts of felony bail jumping, in each case as a repeater. Pursuant to the plea deal, seven additional criminal counts were dismissed and read in for purposes of sentencing. For Count 8, resisting an officer, and Count 10, obstructing an officer, the circuit court imposed one year of initial confinement and one year of extended supervision on each count, to run concurrently with one another and with the sentence imposed on Count 9. For Count 9, felony bail jumping, the court imposed two years of initial confinement and three years extended supervision. For Count 11, the other felony bail-jumping count, the court imposed two years of initial confinement and three years of extended supervision, to run consecutively to all other sentences.² The court also ruled that Baumann would be eligible for the Challenge Incarceration Program and the Substance Abuse Program after he had served at least two years of his sentences.

² During the sentencing hearing, the circuit court originally pronounced the sentence on Count 11 as follows: “With regard to Counts 9 and 11, I’m going to impose a sentence of two years of initial confinement followed by three years of extended supervision.” A few moments later, the court stated, “And then on Count 11, I’m also going to impose, like I said, two years initial confinement followed by two years of extended supervision.” When, as here, an oral pronouncement is ambiguous, we review the full record in an attempt to determine the sentencing court’s intent. *State v. Lipke*, 186 Wis. 2d 358, 364, 521 N.W.2d 444 (Ct. App. 1994). Our review of the entire record supports a determination that the court intended to impose three years, not two years, of extended supervision on Count 11. The original and amended judgments of conviction show three years of extended supervision imposed on Count 11, and the written explanation of determinate sentence filed in the circuit court states that three years of extended supervision were imposed on Count 11. Counsel does not argue in the no-merit report that the court intended to impose anything other than three years of extended supervision on Count 11, and we conclude that any such argument would be without merit.

The no-merit report addresses whether Baumann'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 charge, the rights Baumann was waiving, and other matters. The record shows no other ground to withdraw the plea. There is no arguable merit to this issue.

The no-merit report also addresses Baumann's sentences. As explained in the no-merit report, the sentences are within the legal maximum. Regarding discretionary issues related to sentencing, 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 circuit court considered appropriate factors, did not consider improper factors, and reached a reasonable result. There would be no arguable merit to challenging the court's exercise of sentencing discretion.

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 Dudley is relieved of further representation of Baumann 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