



OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Supreme Court of Wisconsin

110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON, WI 53701-1688

TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880
FACSIMILE (608) 267-0640
Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

FILED
09-03-2025
CLERK OF WISCONSIN
SUPREME COURT

September 3, 2025

To:

Hon. Timothy D. Boyle
Circuit Court Judge
Electronic Notice

John Blimling
Electronic Notice

Amy Vanderhoef
Clerk of Circuit Court
Racine County Courthouse
Electronic Notice

William Q. Howell 657872
Wisconsin Secure Program Facility
P.O. Box 1000
Boscobel, WI 53805-1000

Gregory Bates
Electronic Notice

You are hereby notified that the Court, by its Clerk and Commissioners, has entered the following order:

No. 2025AP152-CRNM State v. Howell, L.C. #2019CF888

On August 29, 2025, defendant-appellant, William Q. Howell, pro se, filed a document entitled "Petition for Review" in which he indicates his intent to seek review of the court of appeals' July 30, 2025 decision in this matter, summarily affirming his convictions. In that document, Howell also requests that the court send him a redacted copy of the presentence investigation ("PSI") report in the underlying criminal case. Further, Howell indicates that while his appellate counsel provided him with paper transcripts and a flash drive with discovery and other trial materials, he is unable to view those files on the prison laptops and requests that counsel be ordered to send him paper copies of the materials on the flash drive. The court construes the document entitled "Petition for Review" as a timely, but nonconforming petition for review and as a motion for production of a redacted copy of the PSI report and demand for a copy of his file materials pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 809.32(b)2. & (d).

IT IS ORDERED that the "Petition for Review" is accepted for filing as a timely, but nonconforming petition for review. However, Howell must file a statement in support of the petition, conforming to the requirements of Wis. Stat. §§ 809.62(2) and (4), with the clerk of this court by November 3, 2025. If the statement is not filed by that time, this petition may be summarily dismissed.

Page 2

September 3, 2025

No. 2025AP152-CRNM State v. Howell, L.C. #2019CF888

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the motion for production of a redacted copy of the PSI report is denied. Howell does not cite any authority entitling him to a copy of the PSI report. See Wis. Stat. § 972.15(4) (setting forth the general rule that after sentencing the PSI report is confidential and parties seeking access must seek “specific authorization of the court”); see also Wis. Stat. § 972.15(4m) (providing that the district attorney and counsel for a defendant are entitled to “have and keep a copy of the presentence investigation report” but that “[i]f the defendant is not represented by counsel, the defendant is entitled to view the presentence investigation report but may not keep a copy of the report.”) Further, as Howell seeks review of a no-merit appeal, his ability to access the PSI report is subject to State v. Parent, 2006 WI 132, ¶45, 298 Wis. 2d 63, 725 N.W.2d 915 (setting forth procedure to obtain access to, but not copies of, the PSI report in no-merit appeals via the circuit court). Finally, we note that the court of appeals’ decision in this case indicates that “Howell does not claim the PSI report was inaccurate.” State v. Howell, No. 2025AP152-CRNM, unpublished op. at 8, n.4. (Wis. Ct. App., July 30, 2025). Howell has not demonstrated any need to access the contents of the PSI report in connection with his petition for review.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Howell’s prior appellate counsel, Attorney Gregory Bates, shall, within 14 days of the date of this order, serve paper copies of the circuit court record and any other documents contained on the flash drive that was previously provided to Howell and shall file a statement in this court that service has been made. See Wis. Stat. § 809.32(d).

Samuel A. Christensen
Clerk of Supreme Court