

FILED
04-27-2022
CLERK OF WISCONSIN
SUPREME COURT

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

Case No. 21-1949

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v. Case No. 2021AP1949-CR
Circuit Court No. 2018CM1416

MICHAEL J. LEIGHTON,

Defendant-Appellant.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

CONNER HELVIG
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
State Bar No. 1117052

Van Severen Law Office, S.C.
316 North Milwaukee Street, Ste 200
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone (414) 270-0202

Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

Table of Contents to Petition for Review

	Page
Issue Presented	3
Reasons For Granting Review.....	3
Statement of Facts and of the Case.....	3
Argument.....	5
Conclusion.....	11
Certification of Form and Length.....	13
Certification of Electronic Filing.....	16
Appendix	100

Authority Cited

<i>State v. Davis</i> , 248 Wis. 2d 986, 637 N.W.2d 62, 2001 WI 136 (2001).....	5, 6, 8
<i>State v. Lewis</i> , 277 Wis. 2d 446, 690 N.W.2d 668, 2004 WI App 211 (2004).....	6
Wisconsin Statute § 971.11(1), (3),(7).....	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

21-1949

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL J. LEIGHTON,

Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Michael Leighton, by Attorney Conner Helvig hereby petitions the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, pursuant to Wis. Stat. §808.10 and Wis. Stat. §809.62 to review the decision or order of the Court of Appeals, District I, in *State of Wisconsin v. Michael J. Leighton*, case no. 2021AP1949-CR, filed on March 30, 2022.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Did the Circuit Court properly exercise its discretion dismissing the case without prejudice because the state failed to bring the case to trial within the time limits set forth in Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3) after Mr. Leighton's prompt disposition request?

The Court of Appeals held that the Circuit Court properly exercised its discretion when deciding to dismiss Mr. Leighton's case with or without prejudice.

REASONS FOR GRANTING REVIEW

The Court should grant review because when the State fails to act in the best interest of justice and in the best interest of the alleged victim in a particular case, a victim's right to restitution should not trump a defendant's right to prompt disposition. The Court did not reason through the factors in a reasonable way.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND OF THE CASE

On November 6, 2018, the State issued a complaint against Michael J. Leighton for one count of misdemeanor theft, with a repeater enhancer, and one count of fraudulent use of a credit card with a repeater enhancer. (R:3).

On or about April 3, 2020, Mr. Leighton, through certified mail, filed for a prompt disposition with the Kenosha County District Attorney's Office pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3). (R:9:1-3). Mr. Leighton was serving a sentence in Stanley Correctional Institution, and had a mandatory release date of January 9, 2024. (R:9:2). On February 12, 2021, Mr. Leighton, by his attorney, filed a motion to dismiss the case based on the violation of Mr. Leighton's request for prompt disposition. (R:9:1-4). On February 16, 2021, Mr. Leighton had his initial appearance and the motion to dismiss was heard. (R:19:1-10). The court commissioner dismissed the case without prejudice and ruled:

Yeah, I guess, here's what I'm looking at as well. And I'm not aware again of any policies in the or in the correctional system that if someone again if this defendant or anyone else had tested positive for COVID that would bar an appearance by Zoom or any other or in person obviously likely in person. I don't have enough information, but I do know that the statute is clear and I don't have that authority before me now, so what I'm going to do I'm going to -- I'm going to dismiss this matter based on 971.11(3) but I'll do it without prejudice.

(R:19:8).

On February 18, 2021, Mr. Leighton filed a De Novo Review Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice because the commissioner failed to state their rationale for the decision. (R:15:1-3). The motion was reviewed de novo on May 14, 2021. (R:27:1-20). The decision to dismiss the case without

prejudice was affirmed. *Id.* The Circuit Court relied on the victim's right to restitution, Mr. Leighton's inability to participate in programming in prison, the pandemic, and the impact on Mr. Leighton's legal defense when stating his decision. *Id.*

On May 17, 2021 defense counsel filed a notice of intent to pursue post-conviction relief. (R:22:1-1). On November 8, 2021, counsel filed the notice of appeal. (R:28:1-1). On March 30, 2022 the Court of Appeals denied Mr. Leighton's appeal.

In that decision, the Appellate Court found that the Circuit Court Judge properly exercised discretion when dismissing Mr. Leighton's case without prejudice.

ARGUMENT

I. The law is clear in that a circuit court has the discretion to dismiss a case with or without prejudice when a criminal case is not brought within the 90-day time limit set forth in Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3); however, the Court erroneously exercised its discretion in dismissing the case without prejudice because it did not reason towards a rational conclusion based on the facts.

When determining if the circuit court properly exercised its discretion in dismissing the criminal case against the defendant without prejudice, a reviewing court will overrule a

discretionary decision by a circuit court if the circuit court erroneously exercise its discretion. An erroneous exercise of discretion occurs when the exercise of discretion is based on an error of law, when the circuit court does not consider the facts of record under the relevant law, or does not reason its way to a rational conclusion. *State v. Davis*, 248 Wis. 2d 986, 637 N.W.2d 62, 2001 WI 136 (2001).

Davis lists a number of factors that a circuit court should consider when determining whether to dismiss a criminal case with or without prejudice. *Id.* at 1005-1006. Some relevant factors include: the reasons for, and the length of the delay; whether the type of case makes it unreasonable to expect preparation within the statutory time period; the defendant's conduct contributing to the delay; the harm to an accused resulting from the delay, such as anxiety and concern; the effect on an accused's legal defenses due to the delay; the impact on the programs and movement within the institutions; the effect on an accused's ability to transfer to a less secure facility; the effect of the delay and dismissal on the public interest in the prompt prosecution of crime; and the impact of the delay and dismissal on the victim. *Id.* The circuit court is to consider and balance these factors, but this is not a complete list and can consider other factors. *Id.*

Once Mr. Leighton filed his prompt disposition, the burden is completely shifted on the state to comply with the statutory time limit for bringing a case to trial. Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3). "Once the district attorney receives the request

under sub. (1), the responsibility for prompt disposition is placed on the district attorney.” *State v. Lewis*, 2004 WI App 211, 277 Wis. 2d 446, 690 N.W.2d 668, 03-3191.

The Court in the case at hand heavily relied upon the fact that Covid-19 had greatly impacted the court system and the Wisconsin Supreme Court Order stopping all jury trials that was issued in March 22, 2020. (R:27:15-16). The Appellant’s contention is not that the Court considered the pandemic in its decision, it certainly caused many delays in the judicial system. The issue is that the Court gave the State a complete pass despite their complete lack of urgency and effort that they put into complying with the prompt disposition request made by Mr. Leighton because of the pandemic. Kenosha County Circuit Court resumed trials on August 31, 2020, with additional safety precautions put in place. (R:9:1). Mr. Leighton served the Kenosha County District Attorney’s Office on April 3, 2020, shortly after the Supreme Court suspended all jury trials and about a year and a half after the case was charged. (R:9:1-4). At the De Novo Review hearing, the State claims that a writ to produce Mr. Leighton from Stanley Correctional Institution was prepared, however, it was not signed by any court, nor was it ever executed. (R:27:9). Stanley Correctional confirmed with an employee at the State Public Defender’s Office that they never received a request to transport Mr. Leighton. (R:18:1). Stanley Correctional further indicated that they were not able to deny any writs even in the Covid-19 era, and that they were allowing defendants to do

zoom hearings in May of 2020. *Id.* Even if jury trials were being tried within the statutory time limit, the State was in no position to comply with Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3) regardless. There was no reason for a delay in this case, and the State should not be allowed to use the pandemic as an excuse for their shortcomings. And even if the Court only considered the time elapsed after jury trials resumed, which was August 31, 2020, Mr. Leighton was still only brought in for an initial appearance in February 16, 2021, over two months beyond the 90-day time limit.

Looking at additional *Davis* factors, this is a misdemeanor case which would not make it unreasonable to prepare for within 90 days. *State v. Davis* 248 Wis. 2d at 1006. The fact that this was a misdemeanor case, and that Mr. Leighton was incarcerated serving other sentences, is what seems to have caused the state to overlook this case. Based on their lack of action, it was apparent that this case was not their top priority. Moreover, Mr. Leighton obviously did nothing to contribute to the delay. It is fair to question when this case would have been heard if he hadn't filed for prompt disposition. Mr. Leighton was also the one who orchestrated his initial appearance. Additionally, Mr. Leighton was deprived of having his classification in the prison system changed due to his pending case. This caused him anxiety, and deprived him of more lucrative work opportunities within the facility. (R:27:6). Further, the delay obviously diminishes his ability to receive concurrent time. His mandatory release date

was January 9, 2024, it could be argued that every day that passes without his case resolving diminishes his ability to receive concurrent time. (R:9:2). All of these factors favor Mr. Leighton. The public also has an interest in cases being heard and resolved quickly, including victims and defendants, regardless of if they are in custody serving other sentences.

The State argues that they acted as quickly as they could have. (R:27:9). The Appellant vehemently disagrees with that statement. The State's admits that they never sent a writ, not to mention it wasn't even signed by a court. *Id.* Preparing the writ, but never executing it, is not a good reason for a delay. *Id.* During the midst of the pandemic, timelines may have been tolled, and court hearings may have been getting adjourned, but that is not an excuse for the State not following through with the writ.

The one factor that weighs in favor of the State is the victim's right to restitution. In the same vein, the delay also may have negatively impacted the victim, and that weighs in favor of Mr. Leighton because it is the State who caused the delay. The State represents the victim. The State had no urgency to make sure the victim received restitution prior to Mr. Leighton filing for prompt disposition, or after. It should be noted that no restitution request was filed in this case prior to its dismissal. Despite all of the factors that weigh in favor of Mr. Leighton, the Court relies on a victim's right to restitution and the fact that Mr. Leighton's legal defenses would not be negatively affected by the delay, in determining a dismissal

without prejudice. (R:27:15-20). The Circuit Court also speculated as to how much restitution may be owed, even though no formal restitution request was filed, nor was there any mention of an amount by the State. *Id.*

This case is a clear and obvious case for dismissal with prejudice. The majority of the factors weigh heavily in Mr. Leighton's favor, most notably, the cause for delay was on the prosecutions lack of action. If we do not count the time elapsed while trials were suspended, the State still exceeded the 90-day time limit by a substantial margin, and made no effort to even try to comply with Mr. Leighton's request. This is a clear violation of Mr. Leighton's right for a prompt disposition. The fact that it is a misdemeanor should not have any weight on the violation of his right under Wis. Stat. § 971.11(3). This was not a complex case; this was a case that was overlooked and neglected by the State.

The Appellate Court ignored a large portion of arguments made by the defense. Mr. Leighton served the DA in April 2020—about a year and a half after he was charged and shortly after SCOW suspended jury trials. The State never delivered a signed writ to produce him from Stanley Correctional. The prison was not denying writs during the pandemic, and it was allowing defendants to do zoom hearings in May 2020. Jury trials resumed in August 2020. The State didn't bother to bring him in for his initial appearance until 150 days after jury trials resumed—in February 2021. The State by their own admission, put this case on the backburner.

This is not a case where a dismissal with prejudice is the only justified result. Restitution should not so easily outweigh a defendant's constitutional rights. It is the Appellant's belief that the Court erroneously exercised its discretion in dismissing the case without prejudice because it did not reason towards a rational conclusion based on the facts. The affirmation by the Appellate Court the Circuit Court properly exercised discretion was incorrect.

Conclusion

This case raises the issues of what constitutes a rational conclusion based on the facts.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 27th day of April, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

CONNER HELVIG
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
State Bar No. 1117052
Van Severen Law Office, S.C.
316 N. Milwaukee Street, Ste 200
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone (414) 270-0202
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

APPENDIX

INDEX TO APPENDIX

	Page
Court of Appeals Decision dated March 30, 2022	100-105

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

21-1949

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL J. LEIGHTON,

Defendant-Appellant.

Certification of Form & Length

I certify that this brief meets the form and length requirements of Rule 809.19(8)(b) and (c) in that it is: proportional serif font, minimum printing resolution of 300 dots per inch, 13 point body text, 11 point for quotes and footnotes, leading of minimum 2 points and maximum of 60 characters per line. The text is 13 point type and the length of the brief is 2,742 words.

Respectfully submitted,

CONNER HELVIG
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
State Bar No. 1117052

Van Severen Law Office, S.C.
316 N. Milwaukee Street, Ste 200
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone (414) 270-0202

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

21-1949

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL J. LEIGHTON,

Defendant-Appellant.

Certification of Appendix

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, at a minimum: (1) a table of contents; (2) the findings or opinion of the circuit court; and (3) portions of the record essential to an understanding of the issue 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 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 person, 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.

Signed: _____,
CONNER HELVIG
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

21-1949

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL J. LEIGHTON,

Defendant-Appellant.

Certification of Electronic Brief

Pursuant to Rule 809.19(12)(f), I hereby certify that the text of the electronic copy of the brief is identical to the text of the paper copy of the brief.

Signed: _____,
CONNER HELVIG
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant