

**RECEIVED**

**03-23-2018**

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS

**CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS  
OF WISCONSIN**

DISTRICT I

---

Appeal Case No. 2017AP000633-CR

---

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

vs.

CHENEYE LESHIA EDWARDS,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

ON APPEAL FROM A JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION  
AND AN ORDER PARTIALLY DENYING A  
POSTCONVICTION MOTION, ENTERED IN  
MILWAUKEE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, THE  
HONORABLE JEFFREY A. KREMERS, PRESIDING

---

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT

---

John Chisholm  
District Attorney  
Milwaukee County

Owen Piotrowski  
Assistant District Attorney  
State Bar No. 1097212  
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Respondent

District Attorney's Office  
821 West State Street, Room 405  
Milwaukee, WI 53233-1485  
(414) 278-4646

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
ARGUMENT .....	1
CONCLUSION .....	3
CERTIFICATION.....	3
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 809.19(12) .....	4

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES CITED**

	<b>Page</b>
<i>State v. Arberry</i> 2018 WI 7, 329 Wis. 2d 254, 905 N.W. 2d 832 .....	1, 2
<i>State v. Matasek</i> 2014 WI 27, 353 Wis. 2d 601, 846 N.W.2d 811 .....	1, 2
<i>State v. Hemp</i> 2014 WI 29, 359 Wis. 2d 320, 856 N.W.2d 320 .....	1

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT I

---

Appeal Case No. 2017AP0006343-CR

---

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

vs.

CHENEYE LESHIA EDWARDS,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

ON APPEAL FROM A JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION  
AND AN ORDER PARTIALLY DENYING A  
POSTCONVICTION MOTION, ENTERED IN  
MILWAUKEE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, THE  
HONORABLE JEFFREY A. KREMERS, PRESIDING

---

BRIEF OF PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT

---

**ARGUMENT**

This Court should uphold the circuit court's decision and deny Mr. Edwards Appeal. The Wisconsin Supreme Court has decided, repeatedly, that a circuit court judge must determine whether a person is eligible for expungement at the time of the sentencing hearing. *See generally State v. Arberry*, 2018 WI 7, 379 Wis. 2d 254, 905 N.W.2d 832; *State v. Matasek*, 2014 WI 27, 353 Wis. 2d 601, 846 N.W.2d 811; *State v. Hemp*, 2014 WI 29, 359 Wis. 2d 320, 856 N.W.2d 320.

Based on the recent *Arberry* decision, that applies even in cases where the issue of expungement is not addressed at the time of sentencing. *Arberry*, 379 Wis. 2d 254, ¶ 9.

In *Arberry*, the defendant did not request expungement, and it was not considered by the court at the time of sentencing. *Id.* ¶¶ 9, 11. The defendant requested expungement for the first time during post-conviction proceedings, and the circuit court determined it was barred from determining expungement at that time. *Id.* ¶¶ 10, 11. The Wisconsin Supreme Court ultimately determined that the defendant was procedurally barred from requesting expungement at that time because, “if a circuit court is going to exercise its discretion to expunge a record, the discretion must be exercised at the hearing where sentence is imposed.” *Id.* ¶¶ 15, 21.

The rule controls this case as well. In Mr. Edwards’ case, expungement was requested by defense counsel, considered by the court, and the court declined to make him eligible. (R45:12-13, 16-18, 20-21). There is no legal reason to allow a court to revisit its expungement decision under these circumstances considering that the circuit court could not revisit its decision if Mr. Edwards had not requested expungement at the time of sentencing. Given that eligibility for expungement *must be* determined at the time of sentencing, whether expungement was 1) considered and denied, or 2) not considered at all, is a distinction without a difference. *Arberry*, 379 Wis. 2d, ¶ 21; *Matasek*, 353 Wis. 2d ¶¶ 6, 45.

Mr. Edwards is essentially seeking sentence modification via expungement based on a new factor, which is barred. (App. Supp. Br. at 2); *see generally Matasek*, 353 Wis. 2d. 601. Mr. Edwards seeks to have the circuit court revisit its decision given his performance on probation. (App. Supp. Br. at 2). By definition, that is a factor that cannot be known at the time of sentencing, so it cannot be considered now.

Lastly, circuit courts do not have inherent authority to expunge criminal records, and the circuit court appropriately exercised its discretion when it declined to make Mr. Edwards eligible for expungement. (*See State’s Initial Br.* at 5 – 10).

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above and in the initial briefs, this Court should deny Mr. Edwards appeal and enter an order affirming the circuit court's decision.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of March, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN CHISHOLM  
District Attorney  
Milwaukee County

---

Owen Piotrowski  
Assistant District Attorney  
State Bar No. 1097212

## CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the rules contained in Wis. Stat. § 809.19 (8) (b) and (c) for a brief produced with a proportional serif font. The word count of this brief is 468.

---

Date

---

Owen Piotrowski  
Assistant District Attorney  
State Bar No. 1097212

**CERTIFICATE 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Owen Piotrowski  
Assistant District Attorney  
State Bar No. 1097212

P.O. Address:

Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office  
821 West State Street- Room 405  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233-1485  
(414) 278-4646  
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Respondent.