



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 II

September 9, 2026

To:

Ralph M. Ramirez
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Monica Paz
Clerk of Circuit Court
Waukesha County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Kathleen A. Lindgren
Electronic Notice

Siegfried Almestica, #193894
Oshkosh Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 3310
Oshkosh, WI 54903-3310

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

2025AP2203-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Siegfried Almestica (L.C. #2024CF202)

Before Lazar, P.J., Grogan, and LoCoco, 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).

Siegfried Almestica appeals a judgment of conviction, entered on his guilty pleas, for manufacture/deliver cocaine (>1-5 g) and possession with intent to deliver cocaine (>5-15 g). His appellate counsel filed a no-merit report pursuant to WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32 (2023-24)¹ and *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Almestica was advised of his right to file a response and has not responded. Online circuit court records and the Department of Corrections' database

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

indicate that Almestica died in March 2026.² After reviewing the Record and counsel’s report, we conclude that there are no issues with arguable merit for appeal. Therefore, we summarily affirm the judgment. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

Broadly, a confidential informant, who was working with police, purchased cocaine from Almestica on three occasions. Police later executed a search warrant at Almestica’s residence and found cocaine, both in bulk and individually packaged, scales with drug residue, and money. The State charged Almestica in a six-count information with three counts of manufacture/deliver cocaine (>1-5 g), possession with intent to deliver cocaine (>15g-40 g), maintaining a drug trafficking place, and possession of drug paraphernalia.

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Almestica pled to one count of manufacture/deliver cocaine (>1-5 g) and an amended charge of possession with intent to deliver cocaine (>5-15 g). The State agreed to move to dismiss and read in the remaining charges and recommend an “unspecified prison” sentence. The circuit court sentenced Almestica to two years’ initial confinement and two years’ extended supervision on the manufacture/deliver-cocaine count and a consecutive sentence of nine years’ initial confinement and three years’ extended supervision on the possession-with-intent-to-deliver-cocaine count. This no-merit appeal follows.

The no-merit report addresses potential issues of whether Almestica’s pleas were knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered and whether the circuit court properly exercised its discretion at sentencing.

² Almestica’s appeal nonetheless continues. *See State v. McDonald*, 144 Wis. 2d 531, 537-39, 424 N.W.2d 411 (1988).

We first agree with counsel's analysis and conclusion that any challenge to the validity of Almestica's pleas would lack arguable merit. See *State v. Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 260, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986). Our review of the Record and of counsel's analysis in the no-merit report satisfies us that the circuit court complied with its obligations for taking Almestica's pleas. See Wis. STAT. § 971.08; *Bangert*, 131 Wis. 2d at 261-62; *State v. Brown*, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906.

With regard to the circuit court's sentencing discretion, our review of the Record confirms that the court appropriately considered the relevant sentencing objectives and factors. See *State v. Odom*, 2006 WI App 145, ¶7, 294 Wis. 2d 844, 720 N.W.2d 695; *State v. Ziegler*, 2006 WI App 49, ¶23, 289 Wis. 2d 594, 712 N.W.2d 76. The resulting sentence was within the maximum authorized by law. See *State v. Scaccio*, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622 N.W.2d 449. The sentence was not so excessive so as to shock the public's sentiment. See *Ocanas v. State*, 70 Wis. 2d 179, 185, 233 N.W.2d 457 (1975). Therefore, there would be no arguable merit to a challenge to the court's sentencing discretion.

Our independent review of the Record discloses no other potential issues for appeal. This court accepts the no-merit report, affirms the judgment of conviction, and discharges appellate counsel of the obligation to represent Almestica further in this appeal.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the circuit court is summarily affirmed. See Wis. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Kathleen A. Lindgren is relieved of further representation of Siegfried Almestica in this appeal. *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