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

November 5, 2026

To:

Hon. Kristine A. Snow
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

Kelly Enright
Clerk of Circuit Court
Dodge County Justice Facility
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Scott A. Szabrowicz
Electronic Notice

Stacy L. Lindert
418 Grant Street
Beaver Dam, WI 53916

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

2025AP1408-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Stacy L. Lindert (L.C. # 2021CF27)
2025AP1409-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Stacy L. Lindert (L.C. # 2021CF162)
2025AP1410-CRNM State of Wisconsin v. Stacy L. Lindert (L.C. # 2021CF377)

Before Graham, P.J., Kloppenburg, and Ziegler, 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).

Stacy L. Lindert appeals judgments of conviction for charges in three consolidated cases: possession of methamphetamine in violation of WIS. STAT. § 961.41(3g)(g) (2023-24)[1] in Dodge County Case No. 2021CF27; possession of methamphetamine in violation of § 961.41(3g)(g) and operating under the influence of an intoxicant (OWI) as a third offense in violation of WIS. STAT. § 346.63(1)(a) in Dodge County Case No. 2021CF162; and possession of

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

methamphetamine with the intent to deliver in violation of § 961.41(1m)(e)3. in Dodge County Case No. 2021CF377. Appellate counsel, Scott A. Szabrowicz, filed a no-merit report pursuant to ***Anders v. California***, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and WIS. STAT. RULE 809.32. Lindert was advised of her right to file a response, but she has not responded. After this court's independent review of the record and counsel's report, we conclude that there are no issues of arguable merit that could be pursued on appeal. We therefore summarily affirm the judgments.

Lindert agreed to plead no contest to the charges above in exchange for the State's promise to strike various enhancers and move to dismiss numerous other charges that would be read in for sentencing purposes. The parties agreed to jointly recommend that the circuit court order a presentence investigation report and that the State would not recommend a total period of initial confinement longer than nine years at a contested sentencing. The court ultimately imposed a total bifurcated sentence of nine years, consisting of four years of initial confinement and five years of extended supervision for the offense of possession with intent to deliver methamphetamine in Case No. 2021CF377; a concurrent three-and-one-half year bifurcated sentence, consisting of 18 months of initial confinement and two years of extended supervision in Case No. 2021CF27; and concurrent one-year of confinement sentences for each of the offenses in Case No. 2021CF162, followed by one year of extended supervision on the possession charge.[2]

[2] The circuit court initially imposed a consecutive one-year jail sentence for the OWI offense in Case No. 2021CF162, but it granted a letter motion from Lindert in 2024, amending the judgment of conviction to make this sentence concurrent.

The first potential issue discussed in the no-merit report is whether there is any arguably meritorious basis for challenging Lindert's pleas as not knowing, intelligent, and voluntary or lacking a factual basis. This court's review of the record—including the plea questionnaire and the plea hearing transcript—confirms that the circuit court complied with its plea-entering obligations pursuant to WIS. STAT. § 971.08, ***State v. Bangert***, 131 Wis. 2d 246, 261-62, 389 N.W.2d 12 (1986), and ***State v. Brown***, 2006 WI 100, ¶35, 293 Wis. 2d 594, 716 N.W.2d 906. The court questioned Lindert about her understanding of the proceedings and constitutional rights, appropriately warned her about the consequences of entering a plea, and concluded that she was "entering her pleas … freely, knowingly, intelligently, and understandingly." This court agrees with counsel's analysis and conclusion that any challenge to the validity of Lindert's no-contest pleas would lack arguable merit.

The no-merit report also addresses whether there is any arguably meritorious basis for challenging the circuit court's exercise of discretion at sentencing. *See* ***State v. Gallion***, 2004 WI 42, ¶17, 270 Wis. 2d 535, 678 N.W.2d 197. This court's review of the record confirms that the circuit court appropriately considered relevant sentencing objectives and factors. *See* ***id.***, ¶41; *see also* ***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 maximum period of initial confinement that Lindert faced on the most serious charge in these cases, possession with intent to distribute between 10 and 50 grams of methamphetamine, was 15 years. WIS. STAT. § 961.41(1m)(e)3.; WIS. STAT. § 973.01(2)(b)4. The maximum period of confinement that Lindert faced on each possession charge was 18 months. § 961.41(3g)(g); § 973.01(2)(b)9. Finally, on the OWI charge, the court was statutorily required to sentence Lindert to between 45 days and one year in jail. WIS. STAT. § 346.65(2)(am)3. The sentences imposed were well

within these limits. *See* ***State v. Scaccio***, 2000 WI App 265, ¶18, 240 Wis. 2d 95, 622 N.W.2d 449 ("A sentence well within the limits of the maximum sentence is unlikely to be unduly harsh or unconscionable."). There is no arguable merit to challenging the court's sentencing discretion.

This court's independent review of the record reveals no other potential issues of arguable merit.

Upon the foregoing, therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgments are summarily affirmed. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.21.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Attorney Scott A. Szabrowicz is relieved of further representation of Lindert in these matters. *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