

**FILED**  
**10-20-2023**  
**CLERK OF WISCONSIN**  
**SUPREME COURT**

STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN SUPREME COURT

Case No. 2022AP002060-CR

---

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

JOHN J. DRACHENBERG,

Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner.

---

PETITION FOR REVIEW

---

Christina Starner  
Attorney at Law  
State Bar No. 1075570

P.O. Box 12705  
Green Bay, WI 54307  
608-213-2228  
starner.law@gmail.com  
Attorney for Defendant-  
Appellant-Petitioner

| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>   | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES .....  | 3           |
| CRITERIA FOR REVIEW .....  | 3           |
| STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS .....  | 4           |
| ARGUMENT.....  | 8           |
| This Court should accept review and find that the off-site search of Drachenberg’s computer files was in violation of Wis. Stat. § 968.15 because it was part of the “execution” of the search and it was conducted more than five days after the search warrant was issued. As such, the warrant was void at the time of the search and all evidence from the computer must be suppressed. .... | 8           |
| CONCLUSION .....   | 11          |
| CERTIFICATION AS TO FORM/LENGTH .....  | 12          |

## **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES**

If the off-site search of a computer, pursuant to a search warrant issued under Wis. Stat. § 968.12, is not completed within five days after the date of the search warrant's issuance pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 968.15(1), does it render the search warrant void under Wis. Stat. § 968.15(2)?

The circuit court answered no.

The court of appeals, in a decision recommended for publication, held that the off-site forensic analysis of the computer, which occurred past the five-day mark, was not part of the warrant's execution for purposes of Wis. Stat. § 968.15. The court held that the warrant's execution was complete when police finished the search of the home and seized the computer.

## **CRITERIA FOR REVIEW**

Under Wis. Stat. § 968.15(1) & (2), a search warrant must be executed and returned within five days of its issuance, or it is void. In this case, a computer was seized from Drachenberg's property within the five-day window, but the off-site search of the computer took place outside the five-day window. This Court should grant review to answer a novel question, the resolution of which will have statewide impact and help develop and clarify the law: does the "execution" of a search warrant, which must be completed within five days pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 968.15, include the off-site search and analysis of computer evidence that was seized? See Wis. Stat. § 809.62(1r)(c)2.

Additionally, since computers are routinely searched and later analyzed off-site pursuant to search warrants in this technology era, review is warranted because this case presents a question of law that is likely to recur unless resolved by the supreme court. Wis. Stat. § 809.62(1r)(c)3.

## STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS

### Criminal Complaint

A criminal complaint was filed on April 20, 2021 charging John Drachenberg with seven counts of child exploitation, three counts of possession of child pornography, misdemeanor possession of THC, and possession of drug paraphernalia. (2; App. 101-06) The complaint alleged that on January 25, 2021, the National Center of Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) received a tip from the video chat website Omegle.com that a user was broadcasting suspected child pornography to another user. (2:6; App. 106). The IP address was tied to a home where Drachenberg lived. (2:6; App. 106). Pursuant to a search warrant, officers searched the home and a surrounding shed which belonged to Drachenberg. Officers seized several items from the shed, including a desktop computer, smoking devices with burnt marijuana residue, and THC belonging to Drachenberg. (2:6; App. 106; 23; App. 107-124).

The complaint further alleged that upon searching the desktop computer, officers found approximately 272 image files and five video files that were believed to depict child pornography. (2:6; App. 106). Officers also found numerous recordings of video chats that Drachenberg had with other users on Omegle.com between May 2020 and November 2020, in which Drachenberg encouraged prepubescent males to expose their genitals or commit other sexual acts. (2:6; App. 106). The complaint further alleged that three prepubescent males did expose their genitals at Drachenberg's request, which were saved onto the desktop computer. (2:6; App. 106).

### Suppression Motions, Hearing, and Circuit Court Ruling

Drachenberg moved to suppress all evidence. (16). Among other arguments,<sup>1</sup> Drachenberg argued that the search of the computer beyond the five-day deadline violates Wis. Stat. § 968.15 and any evidence obtained after that point must be suppressed. (16:12-13).

A hearing on the suppression motion was held on October 25, 2021. (19). At the hearing, Detective Jason Parks testified to the following: a video chat website named Omegle.com had identified a user on their platform who, during a video chat, streamed a video depicting a young girl engaged in sexual activity. (19:7-8). Omegle reported that they captured four still shots of this video, the IP address of the user, and the model of the webcam that was used to broadcast the video. (19:9-10). Omegle forwarded that information to NCMEC on November 5, 2020. (19:10). NCMEC forwarded the cyber tip to the Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) on November 24, 2020. (19:31). The DOJ then investigated who the IP address belonged to and determined that it was connected to a home address of 405 North Cherry Avenue in Marshfield, Wisconsin. (19:11). On January 25, 2021, this information was passed on to Detective Jason Parks from the DOJ and he was assigned to the investigation. (19:7).

Detective Parks testified that he applied to Wood County Circuit Court Judge Nicholas Brazeau for a search warrant, which was issued on January 29, 2021. (19:21; App. 160-77). Specifically, the search warrant included authorization for officers to:

---

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, Drachenberg also argued that: (1) any probable cause was stale by the time the warrant was executed, (2) the warrant did not describe evidence to be seized consistent with the Fourth Amendment particularity requirement, (3) the entry into the home violated the knock and announce requirement, and (4) the search warrant affidavit did not comply with the oath or affirmation requirement. (16). Drachenberg does not pursue these arguments on appeal.

- search the premises and property at 405 North Cherry Avenue in Marshfield, including any storage buildings or outbuildings on the property (23:1; App. 173);
- seize any digital devices found and remove them from the location so they may be searched and analyzed at a later date (23:1; App. 160);
- Obtain copies of the contents of the hard drive(s) and contents of any internal or external storage media (23:11; App. 170).

On February 1, 2021, officers searched the home and outbuildings of the property and removed numerous computers and cell phones from the residence and outbuildings. (19:21-22, 28-29; App. 180-81, 187-88; 2:6; App. 159). Some of those digital devices belonged to the other residents as well as Drachenberg's girlfriend. (19:28-29; App. 187-88).

On the property was a shed that family members said belonged to Drachenberg. (2:6; App. 159; 19:80). Officers seized several items from the shed, including a desktop computer, smoking devices with burnt marijuana residue, and THC. (2:6; App. 159; 19:80). Before the officers removed the desktop computer from the shed, they found two programs on it that are common for people who do illegal activity online, but Detective Parks did not testify that any actual images of child pornography were found on the computer before they removed it from the property. (2:6; App. 159; 19:25; App. 131). Detective Parks completed a return of officer document on February 1, 2021, which included an inventory sheet of the items he collected from the home. (19:21; App. 127).

On February 1, 2021, Detective Parks began reviewing the digital devices off the premises. (19:26; App. 184). Since some of those devices belonged to the other residents, Detective Parks went through those first so he could clear them

of contraband and return them. (19:28-29; App. 187-88). Starting on February 1, 2021, Detective Parks began the process of making a mirror image of Drachenberg's desktop computer, which involved compressing the files and copying them. (19:28, 48; App. 187, 193). He did not know the exact date that he started actually looking at the images from Drachenberg's desktop computer, but he testified that it would have occurred after February 1, 2021 but before March 29, 2021 and it took several weeks. (19:47-49; App. 192-94). When he did look at the images, he found numerous video files that appeared to be child pornography. (19:29; App. 188).

Following the hearing, both parties filed briefs. (27; 28). In an oral ruling on March 21, 2022, the court denied Drachenberg's suppression motion on all bases. (31; App. 125; 47; App. 126-53). The court stated that the search warrant was executed within the timeframe required by statute, as the return on warrant was dated February 1, 2021. (47:11; App. 144).

Following the court's denial of his suppression motion, Drachenberg pled no contest to one count of possession of child pornography contrary to Wis. Stat. § 948.12(1m). (40). Dismissed and read in were seven counts of sexual exploitation of a child – filming, one count of possession of child pornography, one count of possession of THC, and one count of possession of drug paraphernalia. (40). The court sentenced Drachenberg to thirteen years imprisonment, comprised of three years extended supervision and ten years initial confinement (40).

#### Court of Appeals Decision

The court of appeals, in a decision recommended for publication, held that the off-site forensic analysis of the computer, which occurred past the five-day mark, was not part of the warrant's execution for purposes of Wis. Stat. § 968.15. *State v. Drachenberg*, 2022AP2060-CR (Op., pg. 23; App. 123). The court found that the warrant's execution was

complete when police finished the search of the home and seized the computer. (Op., pg. 23; App. 123). Thus, the court of appeals held that the five-day window for executing the search warrant does not apply to the off-site forensic analysis of computers. (Op., pg. 23; App. 123). This petition follows.

### **ARGUMENT**

**This Court should accept review and find that the off-site search of Drachenberg’s computer was in violation of Wis. Stat. § 968.15 because it was part of the “execution” of the search and it was conducted more than five days after the search warrant was issued. As such, the warrant was void at the time of the search and all evidence from the computer must be suppressed.**

Wis. Stat. § 968.15 states that “a search warrant must be executed and returned not more than five days after the date of issuance” and that “any search warrant not executed within the [five-day time period] shall be void and shall be returned to the judge issuing it.”

Aside from the court of appeals decision in this case that is recommended for publication, there is no Wisconsin case law interpreting the meaning of execution of a search warrant under Wis. Stat. § 968.15(1) and whether the five-day deadline applies to the off-site analysis of computer evidence that was seized within the five-day period.

The search warrant in the instant case was issued on January 29, 2021. (23; App. 160-177). The warrant contained language authorizing officers to remove any digital devices from Drachenberg’s home so that those devices may be “searched and analyzed at a later date.” (23:1; App. 160). On February 1, 2021, police seized numerous computers and cell phones from the home, including Drachenberg’s desktop computer. Detective Parks completed a report on February 1, 2021 which listed the items that were seized from the home. (19:28; App. 187).



Starting on February 1, 2021, Detective Parks began the process of making a mirror image of Drachenberg's desktop computer, which involved compressing the files and copying them. (19:28, 48; App. 187, 193). Detective Parks did not know the exact date that he started actually looking at the images, but he testified that it would have occurred after February 1, 2021 but before March 29, 2021, and that it went on for several weeks (19:47-49; App. 192-94). Detective Parks completed another report on March 29, 2021, in which he reported his findings from the search of Drachenberg's computer files. As detailed in that report, Detective Parks found numerous files on Drachenberg's computer depicting child pornography, as well as video files of children doing sexually explicit activities. (19:29; App. 188; 24).

Statutory interpretation is a question of law subject to de novo review. *State v. Peters*, 2003 WI 88, ¶ 13, 263 Wis. 2d 475, 665 N.W.2d 171. Statutory interpretation begins with the plain language of the statute. *State ex rel. Kalal v. Circuit Court*, 2004 WI 58, ¶ 45, 271 Wis. 2d 633, 663, 681 N.W.2d 110. Statutory language is given its common, ordinary and accepted meaning, except that technical or specially-defined words or phrases are given their technical or special definitional meaning. *Bruno v. Milwaukee County*, 2003 WI 28, ¶¶ 8, 20, 260 Wis. 2d 633, 660 N.W.2d 656. *Kalal*, 2004 WI 58, ¶ 45, 271 Wis. 2d 633.

Starting with the plain language of the statute, the term “execute” is not defined in the Wisconsin statutes. As such, we must apply its common, ordinary and accepted meaning. The verb “to execute” is defined in Merriam-Webster's Dictionary as “to carry out fully: put completely into effect.” Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/execute> (last accessed 10/18/23). It is defined in Black's Law Dictionary as “to perform or complete.” *Execute*, *Black's Law Dictionary* (10<sup>th</sup> ed. 2014).

Therefore, to “execute” a warrant is to complete the orders for search and seizure that are contained within it. Police have “executed” a search warrant when they have fully carried out all the commands and directives in the warrant.

In the instant case, searching and analyzing the computer files at a separate location was explicitly within the scope of the search warrant. Specifically, the search warrant directed officers to “seize any digital devices found and remove those from the location so that those devices may be searched and analyzed at a later date.” (23:1; App. 160). Detective Parks searched the computer files for images of child pornography after February 1 but before March 29. (19:47-49; App. 192-94). Thus, he was executing the search warrant (ie: carrying its directives out) during a span of time lasting several weeks, and he had fully carried it out (ie: executed the search warrant) by March 29. Because the execution of the warrant went beyond the five-day time limit in violation of Wis. Stat. § 968.15(1), the warrant was void and any evidence found in the computer files must be suppressed.

The fact that the warrant on its face contains language authorizing officers to search Drachenberg’s computer at a “later date” does not cure the defect; if the “later date” implies a time period of more than five days, then that directive is itself in violation of Wis. Stat. § 968.15 and the warrant cannot override a statutory rule.

An order denying a motion to suppress evidence may be reviewed on appeal notwithstanding a no contest of guilty plea. Wis. Stat. § 971.31(10). When a defendant enters a plea following the circuit court’s denial of a suppression motion, and a reviewing court determines that the circuit court erred, the defendant should be allowed to withdraw his plea unless the state can prove that there was no reasonable probability that the court’s error contributed to the plea. *State v. Semrau*, 2000 WI App 54, ¶ 36, 233 Wis. 2d 508, 608 N.W.2d 376. Here, the

state cannot meet this test because granting suppression of the desktop computer files would have eliminated the state's evidence against Drachenberg to which he pled, and all of his dismissed and read in crimes except for two misdemeanors.

The remedy for a violation of the five-day execution period in Wis. Stat. § 968.15 could not be more clear; the legislature has declared that a warrant that is not executed within that time frame "shall be void." When the directives of the search warrant cannot be fully carried out within five-day statutory time limit, the solution is simple: the officers can get a new warrant. Because the officers did not do so here and searched the computer files beyond the five-day timeline, that evidence must be suppressed.

In sum, this Court should accept review to clarify the meaning of execution of a search warrant under Wis. Stat. § 968.15(1) and whether the five-day deadline applies to the off-site analysis of computer evidence that was seized within the five-day period.

### **CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, Drachenberg respectfully asks this Court to grant this petition and review the case, then remand with directions to grant suppression of evidence found on Drachenberg's desktop computer and to allow Drachenberg to withdraw his plea.

Dated this 20th day of October, 2023.

ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED BY  
CHRISTINA C. STARNER  
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 1075570

ADDRESS:  
P.O. Box 12705

Green Bay, WI 54307  
(608) 213-2228  
starner.law@gmail.com

**CERTIFICATION AS TO FORM AND LENGTH**

I certify that this petition meets the form and length requirements of Rule 809.19(8)(b) & (bm) and 809.62(4) for a petition produced with a proportional serif font. The length of the petition is 2,600 words.

Dated this 20th day of October, 2023.

ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED BY  
CHRISTINA C. STARNER  
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant  
State Bar No. 1075570

ADDRESS:  
P.O. Box 12705  
Green Bay, WI 54307  
(608) 213-2228  
starner.law@gmail.com