STATE OF WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT II

RECEIVED

06-29-2015

CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS OF WISCONSIN

Appeal No. 2015AP000585 Winnebago County Circuit Court Case Nos. 2014 TR 0007212

COUNTY OF WINNEBAGO,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

KELLI MARIE KOSMOSKY,

Defendant-Appellant.

AN **APPEAL FROM** THE **JUDGEMENT OF** CONVICTION AND THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION **DEFENDANT'S** FOR SUPPRESSION OF **EVIDENCE** IN **CIRCUIT FOR** THE **COURT** WINNEBAGO COUNTY, THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. GRITTON, PRESIDING

THE REPLY BRIEF AND APPENDIX OF THE DEFENDANT-APPELLANT KELLI MARIE KOSMOSKY

By: Walter A. Piel, Jr.
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant
State Bar No. 01023997

Piel Law Office 500 W. Silver Spring Drive Suite K-200 Milwaukee, WI 53217 (414) 617-0088 (920) 390-2088 (FAX)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	2
ARGUMENT	3
CONCLUSION	. 4
FORM AND LENGTH CERTIFICATION	5
CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 809.19(12)	6
	-
APPENDIX CERTIFICATION	
APPENDIX	9
Excernts from Motion Hearing - 10/7/2014 R	enlyAnn 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	Page No.
<u>CASES</u>	
Wisconsin Supreme Court	
State v. Nordness, 128 Wis.2d 15, 381 N.W.2d 300 (1986)	
Wisconsin Court of Appeals	
<i>Village of Elkhart Lake v. Borzyskowski</i> , 123 Wis.2d 185, 366 N.W. 2d 506 (Ct. App 1985)	4

ARGUMENT

While the County argues that Trooper Koehler had sufficient probable cause to believe that Ms. Kosmosky was operating her vehicle while impaired, the County does not address the crux of Ms. Kosmosky's argument that they failed to establish a time of driving.

This is not a case where the motion hearing record reveals a time of operation, or where the officer felt the hood of the vehicle to establish that it was warm thus suggesting recent operation. In fact, Trooper Koehler concedes that prior to the arrest, he did not determine the time in which the vehicle was driven to the location. (R.30:12/ ReplyApp. 1). The issue is whether based on the facts adduced at the motion hearing, would a reasonable officer conclude that Ms. Kosmosky was intoxicated at the time of operation. Probable cause "exists where the totality of the circumstances within the arresting officer's knowledge at the time of the arrest would lead a reasonable police officer to believe ...that the defendant was operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an intoxicant." State v. Nordness, 128 Wis.2d 15, 35, 381 N.W.2d 300 (1986). Probable cause requires that at the moment of arrest, an officer knew of facts and circumstances that were sufficient to warrant a prudent person to believe that the person arrested had committed or was committing an offense. *Village of Elkhart Lake v. Borzyskowski*, 123 Wis.2d 185, 189, 366 N.W. 2d 506 (Ct. App 1985).

Because the record does not reveal a time of operation a reasonable officer would not have concluded that Ms. Kosmosky was impaired at the moment of operation.

CONCLUSION

Because of the above the evidence was insufficient to establish that Ms. Kosmosky was impaired at the moment that she operated her vehicle. Thus, the trial court erred in denying Ms. Kosmosky's motion for suppression of evidence. The court should reverse the trial court's ruling and vacate the Judgment of Conviction.

Dated this 29th day of June, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted
Piel Law Office

Walter A Piel, Jr. Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant State Bar No. 01023997

Mailing Address:

500 W. Silver Spring Drive Suite K200 Milwaukee, WI 53217 (414) 617-0088 (920) 390-2088 (FAX)

FORM AND LENGTH CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certify that this brief and appendix conform to the rules contained in secs. 809.19(6) and 809.19(8) (b) and (c). This brief has been produced with a proportional serif font. The length of this brief is 10 pages. The word count is 1219.

Dated this 29th day of June, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted

Piel Law Office

Walter A Piel, Jr. Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant State Bar No. 01023997

Mailing Address:

500 W. Silver Spring Drive Suite K200 Milwaukee, WI 53217 (414) 617-0088 (920) 390-2088 (FAX)

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 809.19(12)

I hereby certify that:

I have submitted an electronic copy of this brief, excluding the appendix, if any, which complies with the requirements of s. 809.19(12).

I further certify that:

This electronic brief is identical in content and format to the printed form of the brief filed as of this date.

A copy of this certificate has been served with the paper copies of this brief filed with the court and served on all opposing parties.

Dated this 29th day of June, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Piel Law Office

Walter A. Piel, Jr.
Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant
State Bar No. 01023997

APPENDIX CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that filed with this brief, either as a separate document or as a part of this brief, is an appendix that complies with s. 809.19(2)(a) and that contains: (1) a table of contents; (2) relevant trial court record entries; (3) the findings or opinion of the trial court; and (4) portions of the record essential to an understanding of the issues raised, including oral or written rulings or decisions showing the trial court's reasoning regarding those issues.

I further certify that if this appeal is taken from a circuit court order or a judgment entered in a judicial review of an administrative decision, the appendix contains the findings of fact and conclusions of law, if any, and final decision of the administrative agency.

I further certify that if the record is required by law to be confidential, the portions of the record included in the appendix are reproduced using first names and last initials instead of full names of persons, specifically including juveniles and parents of juveniles, with a notation that the portions of the record have been so reproduced to preserve confidentiality and with appropriate references to the record.

Dated this 29th day of June, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter A. Piel, Jr. Attorney for the Defendant-Appellant State Bar No. 01023997

APPENDIX

10