

FILED
12-05-2024
CLERK OF WISCONSIN
SUPREME COURT

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

Case No. 2023AP617-CR

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Plaintiff-Respondent

v.

Case No: 24AP115

Circuit Court Case No. 21CF3408

LYNETTA LAKE

Defendant-Appellant

Petition for Review From the Decision of the Court of
Appeals 1st District

**PETITION OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT,
LYNETTA LAKE**

KIRK D. HENLEY

Attorney for Appellant-Defendant

State Bar No. 1107974

The Law Office of Kirk Henley, LLC

P.O. Box 511820

Milwaukee, WI 53203

attykirkhenley@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	3
ISSUES PRESENTED	5
CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	6
Statement of the Case	6
Statement of the Record	6
Statement of the Facts	7
Argument	7
I. The motion filed by defense alleged sufficient facts that, if true, constituted ineffective assistance of counsel, and entitled Ms. Lake to an evidentiary hearing.	8
A. Standard of Review	8
B. The motion filed by defense sufficiently alleged that Ms. Lake's trial counsel was deficient for not calling two known witnesses to testify on behalf of Ms. Lake at the restitution hearing.	9
C. Defense's motion sufficiently alleged prejudice because the testimony of the two witnesses would have overcome the credibility of the sole witness of the state.	10
CONCLUSION	11
Appendix	101

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

State v. Allen,
2004 WI 106
274 Wis.2d 568,
682 N.W.2d 433

State v. Balliette,
336 Wis.2d 358,
805 N.W.2d 334,
2011 WI 79 (Wis. 2011)

State ex rel. Flores v. State,
516 N.W.2d 362,
183 Wis.2d 587 (Wis. 1994)

State v. Guerard,
2004 WI 85
273 Wis.2d 250,
682 N.W.2d 12

State v. Gutierrez,
2020 WI 52,
391 Wis. 2d 799,
943 N.W.2d 870.

State v. Jenkins,
2014 WI 59,
355 Wis.2d 180,
848 N.W.2d 786 (Wis. 2014)

State v. Machner,
92 Wis.2d 797,
285 N.W.2d 905 (Ct. App. 1979)

State v. Ruffin,
2022 WI 34,
401 Wis. 2d 619,
974 N.W.2d 432

Strickland v. Washington,
466 U.S. 668,
104 S.Ct. 2052
80, L.Ed.2d 674 (1984)

United States Constitution

6th Amendment

Wisconsin Constitution

Article 1 Section 7

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

Case No. 2023AP617-CR

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Plaintiff-Respondent

v.

Case No: 24AP115

Circuit Court Case No. 21CF3408

LYNETTA LAKEDefendant-Appellant

Petition for Review From the Decision of the Court of
Appeals 1st District

ISSUES PRESENTED

Defense filed a motion on October 20, 2023. The motion alleged that the appellant, Lynetta Lake, advised her trial attorney of two witnesses who could testify at the restitution hearing. The motion attached letters from both witnesses. The motion also alleged that Ms. Lake's trial attorney did not call the witnesses at the restitution hearing. Finally, the motion alleged that Ms. Lake was prejudiced by the failure to call these two witnesses because the state provided no evidence at the restitution hearing other than the testimony of the victim. The circuit court denied the motion without a hearing in an order on January 5, 2024.

Question Presented:

Whether the postconviction motion filed by the Defense alleged sufficient facts to show that Ms. Lake was denied her right to effective counsel when Defense's postconviction motion alleged that Ms. Lake informed her attorney of two potential witnesses who could testify on her behalf and her

attorney did not call those two witnesses at the restitution hearing.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

The 6th Amendment of the United States Constitution and section 7 of the 1st article of the Wisconsin Constitution grant the right to counsel to a defendant in a criminal matter. U.S. Const. amend. VI, Wis. Const art I § 7. This Court grants review only where special or important reasons are presented. Wis. Stat. § 809.62(1r). A case presents a special or important reason for review where a case presents a real and significant issue of federal or state constitutional law. Wis. Stat 809.62(1r)(a). Whether a postconviction motion alleging ineffective assistance of counsel alleges sufficient facts is a matter of law that this Court reviews de novo. *State v. Balliette*, 336 Wis.2d 358, 805 N.W.2d 334, 2011 WI 79 (Wis. 2011). "The ultimate conclusion as to whether there was ineffective assistance of counsel is a question of law." *Id.* citing *State ex rel. Flores v. State*, 516 N.W.2d 362, 183 Wis.2d 587 (Wis. 1994).

The issue presented in this matter is whether Ms. Lake's postconviction motion alleged sufficient facts to show that her counsel was ineffective. Issues involving the right to effective assistance of counsel are significant issues of constitutional law. Because this petition asks this Court to rule on a significant issue of constitutional law, this Court should grant review of Ms. Lake's case.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Statement of the Record:

On August 11, 2021 the state filed a criminal complaint alleging one count of second degree reckless endangering safety contrary to section 941.30(2) of the Wisconsin statutes. (R. 2:1). The complaint alleged that Police Officer Steve Krejci spoke with the Victim, G.J., and that G.J. stated that on August 10, 2021, Lynetta Lake crashed into G.J.'s vehicle twice and fled the scene without checking on G.J. *Id.* at 1-2. Ms. Lake entered a guilty plea to negligent operation of a motor vehicle and hit and run on October 26, 2022. (R. 52:25). The circuit court held a restitution hearing for this matter on December 9, 2022. (R 47:1). The state submitted a document listing the request for restitution from G.J. (R.38). An order from this

Court on August 28, 2023 extended the deadline to file for postconviction relief to October 27, 2023. (R. 51). On October 20, 2023, Defense filed a motion alleging that Ms. Lake's trial counsel was ineffective for failing to call two witnesses that Ms. Lake alleged that she spoke to her attorney about prior to the December 9 restitution hearing. (R. 53). The motion filed by Defense provided letters from both of the potential witnesses regarding their knowledge of G.J. and Ms. Lake as well as the vehicle that G.J. drives. *Id.* 7-8. The circuit court denied defense's motion without a hearing in an order on January 5, 2024. (R. 63). A notice of appeal was timely filed by defense on January 24, 2024. (R. 64).

Defense timely filed a brief with the Court of Appeals on March 20, 2024. The State filed its response on July 31, 2024. Defense timely filed a reply brief on August 14, 2024. The Court of Appeals' 1st district filed a written decision on November 12, 2024, affirming the decision of the circuit court. Ms. Lake now petitions this Court for review.

Statement of the Facts:

At the December 9 restitution hearing, the state provided no documentation other than the previously mentioned request for restitution to prove the restitution amount or the make and model of the vehicle that Ms. Lake struck on August 10, 2021. (R. 47: 31). G.J., the victim in the case, testified that the vehicle that was struck on August 10, 2021 was a maroon colored Mercedes Benz (R:47:8). The state did not call any other witnesses at the hearing. At the same hearing, Ms. Lake testified that the vehicle which she struck on August 10, 2021 was white and not the maroon-colored vehicle described by G.J. (R. 47:33). The circuit court ruled in favor of the State regarding the restitution request. (R. 47:46)

Argument

I. The motion filed by defense alleged sufficient facts that, if true, constituted ineffective assistance of counsel, and entitled Ms. Lake to an evidentiary hearing.

The motion filed by defense sufficiently alleged ineffective assistance of counsel. Where a defendant's postconviction motion, raising an ineffective representation claim alleges

“sufficient material facts that, if true, would entitle the defendant to relief requested, the Court “must hold an evidentiary hearing.” *State v. Allen*, 2004 WI 106 ¶9, 274 Wis.2d 568, 682 N.W.2d 433. A hearing, and an opportunity for trial counsel to testify is “a prerequisite to a claim of ineffective representation” and necessary to “determine whether trial counsel’s actions were the result of incompetence or deliberate trial strategies.” *State v. Machner*, 92 Wis.2d 797, 804, 285 N.W.2d 905 (Ct. App. 1979).

A defendant in the state of Wisconsin has the right to effective assistance of counsel. Wisconsin Constitution Article 1 section 7; U.S. constitution 6th Amendment. A defendant is denied their right to effective assistance of counsel where the defendant’s counsel fails to perform in a way that a reasonable attorney would perform under the same circumstances and where the defendant was prejudiced by their counsel’s deficient performance. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052 80, L.Ed.2d 674 (1984).

A. Standard of Review

This court should review the issues of whether the postconviction motion filed by defense alleged sufficient facts that, if true, would entitle Ms. Lake to relief De Novo. Whether a “[postconviction] motion on its face alleges sufficient material facts that, if true, would entitle the defendant to relief” or “the record conclusively demonstrates that the defendant is entitled to no relief” are questions of law reviewed de novo. *State v. Ruffin*, 2022 WI 34, ¶ 27, 401 Wis. 2d 619, 974 N.W.2d 432. “[W]hether a defendant received ineffective assistance of counsel [presents] a mixed question of fact and law.” *State v. Gutierrez*, 2020 WI 52, ¶ 19, 391 Wis. 2d 799, 943 N.W.2d 870. This Court upholds the circuit court’s factual findings, which include findings concerning the “circumstances of the case and trial counsel’s conduct and strategy,” unless they are clearly erroneous. *Id.* Whether counsel’s performance constitutes ineffective assistance presents a legal question that this Court reviews de novo. *Id.*

In this case, the question that is presented to this Court is whether the facts alleged in Ms. Lake’s postconviction motion,

if true, would constitute ineffective assistance of counsel. Because the circuit court denied the motion without a hearing, there are no factual findings of the circuit court for this court to review. Because the question of whether Ms. Lake's postconviction motion, if true, would constitute ineffective assistance of counsel is a question of law this court should review this matter De Novo.

B. The motion filed by defense sufficiently alleged that Ms. Lake's trial counsel was deficient for not calling two known witnesses to testify on behalf of Ms. Lake at the restitution hearing.

The first step in determining whether a defendant's counsel was ineffective is to determine whether their decision at the time were deficient under the circumstances. "In considering alleged incompetency of counsel, one should not reconstruct the ideal, perfect defense or the best defense but only to one which under all the facts gives him reasonable effective representation." *State v. Machner*, 285 N.W.2d 905, 907 92 Wis.2d 797 (Wis. App. 1979). Quoting *State v. Harper*, 57 Wis.2d 543, 556-7, 205 N.W.2d 1,9 (1973).

Defense's motion alleged that Ms. Lake's counsel performed deficiently when he failed to call two witnesses during the Deficient performance is performance that falls below the line of what a reasonable attorney would do given the same circumstances. "Failure to call a potential witness may constitute deficient performance." *State v. Jenkins*, 2014 ¶ 50 WI 59, 355 Wis.2d 180, 199, 848 N.W.2d 786, 795 (Wis. 2014).

In Jenkins the defendant's trial counsel knew of the existence of a witness that would have testified in a way that would have contradicted the testimony of a witness upon who's testimony the entirety of the state's case rested on. *Id.* The facts of the current case, if true as alleged, are similar to the facts of Jenkins because Ms. Lake's attorney is alleged to have known of the existence of not one but two potential witnesses that would have contradicted the testimony of G.J. at the restitution hearing. G.J. was the sole witness for the state at the restitution hearing and the state's case rested entirely on her testimony.

The letter attached to defense's motion written by Griffin Lake Jr. on April 25, 2023 states "the vehicle [G.J.] was driving on the day of the accident was white. My sister struck a white large size sedan" (R. 53:7). The language of the letter implies that Griffin Lake Jr. observed the crash. Griffon Lake's potential testimony is material to the matter of restitution because it contradicts the testimony of the state's witness. If it is true, as alleged, that Ms. Lake informed her trial counsel of the information to which Griffin Lake Jr. would testify and Ms. Lake's attorney did not call Griffon Lake Jr. to testify then this performance is deficient.

C. Defense's motion sufficiently alleged prejudice because the testimony of the two witnesses would have overcome the credibility of the sole witness of the state.

Ms. Lake was prejudiced by her trial counsel's deficient performance because the testimony of the two witnesses would have overcome the credibility of the sole witness provided by the state. The second prong of the test for ineffective assistance of counsel is the prejudice prong. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 694. Prejudice to determine ineffective assistance is defined as "a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's error, the result of the proceeding would have been different. *State v. Guerard*, 2004 WI 85 ¶ 43, 273 Wis.2d 250, 682 N.W.2d 12 (Citing *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 694). "A reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome." *Id.* "Whether counsel's deficient performance satisfies the prejudice prong of *Strickland* depends upon the totality of the circumstances at trial." *State v. Jenkins*, 2014 ¶ 50 WI 59, 355 Wis.2d 180, 199, 848 N.W.2d 786, 795 (Wis. 2014).

In the current case, the state's sole witness at the restitution hearing was G.J. who was the victim in this matter. The state provided no evidence other than G.J.'s testimony at the hearing. Similarly, defense only provided testimony from one witness at the restitution hearing. Ms. Lake's testimony contradicted G.J.'s testimony. The two potential witnesses who were not called at the restitution hearing would have also contradicted G.J.'s testimony with their testimony.

With three witnesses testifying in a way that contradicts the sole witness of the state, defense would have likely been able to overcome the testimony of the state's witness. More witnesses to corroborate Ms. Lake's version of events strengthens the argument of defense. Based on the circumstances at the restitution hearing, there is a reasonable probability that with the two additional witnesses to testify for defense, the outcome of the proceeding would have been different. Because there is a reasonable probability that the outcome would have been different, the failure to call these two witnesses was prejudicial to Ms. Lake.

Because the motion filed by defense sufficiently alleged deficient performance and sufficiently alleged prejudice, this court should reverse the decision of the circuit court and remand this matter to the circuit court for further proceedings.

CONCLUSION

For the aforementioned reasons the defendant-appellant asks this Court to review this matter and at the conclusion of its review to reverse the decision of the court of appeals and remand this case to the circuit court for a *Machner* hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated on this 5th day of December, 2024.

Electronically Signed by Kirk D. Henley

KIRK D. HENLEY
Attorney for Appellant-Defendant
State Bar No. 1107974

The Law Office of Kirk Henley, LLC
P.O. Box 511820
Milwaukee, WI 53203
attykirkhenley@gmail.com

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUPREME COURT

Case No. 2023AP617-CR

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Plaintiff-Respondent

v.

Case No: 24AP115

Circuit Court Case No. 21CF3408

LYNETTA LAKEDefendant-Appellant

Certification

I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the rules contained in s. 809.19 (8) (b), (bm), and (c) for a brief in that it is proportional serif font, minimum printing resolution of 300 dots per inch, 13-point body text. The text is 13-point type and the length of the brief is 2110 words.

Dated December 5, 2024 at Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Respectfully submitted

Electronically Signed by Kirk D. Henley

KIRK D. HENLEY

Attorney for Appellant-Defendant

State Bar No. 1107974

The Law Office of Kirk Henley, LLC

P.O. Box 511820

Milwaukee, WI 53203

attykirkhenley@gmail.com