

APR 21 2023

CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS
OF WISCONSIN

State of Wisconsin, (Plaintiff/Criminals/Respondent) v.
William J Buffo III, (Appellant/Victim & Framed Defendant)

(Wis App. IV District.) (Appellant Brief)
Court of Appeals of Wisconsin, District IV

State of Wisconsin, Plaintiff/Criminals/Respondent

v.

William J Buffo III, Appellant/Victim & Framed Defendant

Nos. 22 AP1804 & 22 AP1803

April 8, 2023

Appeal from denial of Motions to ^①reopen and dismiss &
^② withdrawal of Plea in Circuit Court for cases 20cf2667
(only case that existed in circuit court) and 20cm2222 (FBI
needed to help the State & local Frauds frame William J
Buffo III) in Dane County, the Dishonorable Judge Christine
Tayler refuses to Recuse herself & is still presiding!
DKts 203 (withdraw of plea motion) & 204 (motion to reopen & dismiss)
in case 20cf2667 & denial order (only filed denial) for both
is Dkt 243 [Filed in 20cf2667]

Brief of Framed Defendant & Appellant/Victim
William J Buffo III, Pro Se
(framed defendant & Appellant/Victim)

still illegally/deliberately jailed @ 115 W Doty St Madison WI 53703

① [Appeal Brief 48 total pages]

* i Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities

1. Statement of Issues, case, & Facts
2. Statement on Oral Argument
& publication, if needed
3. Argument
4. Conclusion
5. Index to Appeal brief with Appendix cited

* ii Table of AuthoritiesCases Sited

- Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 29, 34, 37, 38, 43
Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)
- State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 27, 29, 34, 37, 38, 44
236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct. App 1993)

Cases sited by Judge Taylor disproven to ever pertain
to a dishonest argument.

- State v. Henley, 2010 WI 97, 328 Wis. 2d 544, 787 N.W. 2d 350 40

Statutes Cited

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Wis. Stat. § 806.07..... | 5, 7, 12, 39, 40 |
| Wis. Stat. § 809.83(2)..... | 42 |
| Wis. Stat. § 971.10..... | 7, 8, 12, 20, 21, 39 |
| 18 US Code Stat § 3161(b)..... | 20 |

Current Motions w/ Statutes Cited in Appeals Court

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Wis. Stat. § 809.31 & 809.14..... | 6 |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Articles & Amendments of US or WI Constitutions

| | |
|---|--------|
| Article I, section 7 of the WI Constitution..... | 20, 21 |
| 6 th Amendment of the US constitution..... | 20, 21 |

★ Statements of Issues, Case, & Facts

William J Buffo III filed a motion for speedy trial violation/demand and a motion to dismiss on 5/7/21. Somehow Judge Taylor fraudulently denied the filing of these 2 motions on 5/11/21.

Judge Taylor fraudulently denied William J Buffo III's motion to reopen & dismiss that factually proved her actions of denying the filing of these 2 motions would have dismissed open cases 20cf2667 & 20cm2222 when they were open, prior to the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21 (OKT 204 in 20cf2667; AFP 347-351), had the speedy trial violation/demand been filed on 5/7/21. 90 days from 5/7/21 is 8/5/21. No trial was ever scheduled. Judge Taylor ignores the 5 page motion of facts.

Judge Taylor fraudulently denied William J Buffo III's motion to withdraw a plea that Judge Taylor, ADA Tracy McMiller, and attorney David R. Anderson made on his behalf @ the forced/fake/fraudulent Plea Hearing on 8/27/21. Judge Taylor covers for the 3 of these FRAUDS while ignoring the factual arguments and attachments within William J Buffo III's motion to withdraw plea (DKt 203 in 20cf2667; APP 333-346). Judge Taylor again refuses to recuse herself and ignores these facts, proving Manifest injustice and failure of assistance of counsel and the court to William J Buffo III.

The only fraudulent filed denial by Judge Taylor, pertaining to these two motions (DKts 204, 203 in 20cf2667; APP 333-351) was filed as Document 243 in 20cf2667; APP 404-428 on 9/30/22. 90 days from the filed date of the 2 motions is 8/9/22!

William J Buffo III received a fraudulent denial via mail, dated 6/3/22, responding to his motion to request & dismiss (DKt 204 in 20cf2667; APP 347-351). This fraudulent denial that wasn't filed in any case at Davie County Courthouse, contained an excuse, without a legal argument, for denying DKt 204 in case 20cf2667; APP 347-351. That is why it wasn't filed in either case. It also contained an update on a decision to be made

on the motion to withdraw plea (DKT 203 in 20cf2667;
APP 333-346).

This unfiled denial orders the "state" has 2 weeks to provide a response, then the appropriate scheduling of a hearing will take place, 2 weeks from 6/3/22 is 6/17/22. The state didn't file a response until 7/1/22 (DKT 207 in 20cf2667;
APP 352-365). Judge Taylor should have just scheduled a trial date when the state failed to comply with this order, but she didn't.

Judge Taylor acting as "Head of State" not a referee, and defies her own orders on this denial!

This fraudulent unfiled denial gets filed within William J Buffalo III's ultimate motion for relief & dismissal as DKT 229, pages 15 & 16 in APP 381-382. This ultimate motion for relief and dismissal proves to have been the 3rd "post conviction" motion proving dismissal of these 2 fraudulent cases after gaining relief under WI STAT § 806.07(1)(c), and dismissed for FRAUD on the Court, District Attorneys Office, William J Buffalo III's private attorneys, law enforcement, & the FBI. Judge Taylor refuses to recuse herself & verbally denies on 1/26/23.

(5)

Judge Taylor abusively / fraudulently sentenced William J Buffo III on 1/26/23 and now All government involved is still continuing the illegal jailing of him, to quiet him as long as possible.

The SPD Appellate is handling the appeal of this 3rd denied motion as cases 23AP303 and 23AP302. Acting as if they are Turtles...

The court of Appeals is fraudulently denying William J Buffo III bond, pending appeals. The fraudulent denials are in response to motions filed with factual attachments proving release should be granted, under WI State 809.31 and 809.14. This fraud is to prevent the filing / completion of appeal brief & Appendix filing.

Statement on Oral Argument & Publication

Oral Argument was only desired, if needed. It is clear and will be understood to be unnecessary, after verifying facts in this appeal brief. It will save ADA McMiller a complete embarrassment as well!

Please use my correct legal name of William J Buffo III and publish due to Massive Fraud being

proven. The case law that could be utilized for the majority of the real victims (defendants being framed with fraudulent discoveries). It would be ethically & morally correct to add this case law for publication to address the massive civil injustices, under WI STAT 806.07 that the defendant receives from the DA's office, law enforcement, & especially the court & SPD!

Argument

The motion to reopen and dismiss reads as follows (OK# 204, page 1 in case 20cf2667; App 347) filed 5/11/22.

Now comes the defendant William J Buffo ~~III~~ and hereby moves the court to reopen and dismiss the above cases against the defendant pursuant to 971.10(2), 971.10(1), and 806.07. In support of his motion, he relies upon the facts contained in affidavit and documents.

A hearing on this matter will be held at the following time and date: time: _____ date: _____

Dane County Courthouse

215 S Hamilton St room _____

Madison WI 53703

Presiding official: _____

(7)

At this hearing, the defendant will request that the court grant the following relief:

2. Dismissal of the action for failure to provide him a speedy trial pursuant to section 971.10(2) and 971.10(1).

The affidavit in support of the motion to reopen and dismiss reads as follows (DKt 204, pages 243 in 20cf2667; APP 348-349):

I, William J Buffo III, being first duly sworn on oath do hereby state:

- 1) I am the defendant in the above action. On Aug. 27th, 2021, I was convicted of 2 counts of knowingly violate a restraining order, 1 count of using a computer message to threaten/injury harm in 20cf2667 & 1 count of damage to prop. 20cm2222.
- 2) Sentence was withheld and I was placed on 2 years of probation with conditions including psych evaluation if deemed appropriate by agent. Also Certified domestic violence treatment.
- 3) On May 7th, 2021, I attempted to file two documents and a number of attachments. They were a motion for violation/demand of speedy trial and a motion to dismiss.

I went to file those documents with the clerk of court's office in Dane County. My intention was that those motions would be e-filed and through the e-filing system, would be served on the opposing party.

4) The clerk that took the pleading from me and apparently went to speak to Judge Taylor about them. I have attached a copy of the cover sheet which shows that it was stamped as "Received" by the Dane County Circuit Court and another stamp that it was "Filed" by the Dane County Circuit Court. The stamp was subsequently crossed out.

5) There was a handwritten note on the cover sheet stating "Judge Taylor declined filing. DOC's returned to Atty." That note is dated 5/11/21 and initialed by what appears to be "JC." I picked up the cover sheet, 2 motions, and attachments to the motions from my failure of attorney, Nathan Otis.

6) As the stampings show, I made a speedy trial violation/demand on 5/7/21. No trial was held within 90 days of the demand.

7) I also filed a Motion to dismiss w/ attachments. That motion was never heard before the Court.

8) I am requesting the matter be reopened and dismissed due to failure of the court to grant me a speedy trial or my motion to dismiss prior to the forced/fraudulent plea hearing held on August 27th, 2021.

The cover page for the speedy trial violation/demand and motion to dismiss with attachments shows it was stamped "filed" & "Received" on 5/7/21, when submitted for filing to Dane County Courthouse. The "filed" stamp was crossed out and there was a handwritten note that states "Judge Taylor declined filing, Doc's returned to Atty" signed with the initials "JC", dated 5/11/21.

(DKt 204 page 4 in 20cf2667; APP: 350 [motion to reopen & dismiss and DKt 203, page 10 in 20cf2667; APP 342 [motion to withdraw plea])

The speedy trial violation/demands were submitted as an attachment to both the motion to reopen & dismiss and the motion to withdraw plea on 5/11/22 as DKt 204 page 5 in 20cf2667; APP 351 [motion to reopen & dismiss] & DKt 203 page 11 in 20cf2667; APP 343 [motion to withdraw plea]

Judge Christine Taylor should have immediately recused herself and a different presiding official should have heard the motion, reopened & dismissed both fraudulent cases 20cf2667 & 20cm2222.

On Judge Taylor's decision and order regarding defendant's motion to withdraw plea, the 1st sentence on page 1, through the rest of the introduction on page 2, Judge Taylor states "Mr. Buffo also brings another motion to reopen and dismiss his cases, which I previously denied a similar motion and see no basis for reconsideration, despite the different basis alleged (Defendant's Motion to reopen OKT 204 in 20cf2667; APP 347-351). For this reason and for the reasons set forth below on the plea withdrawal Motion, these motions are denied without a hearing (OKT 243, pages 1 & 2 in 20cf2667; APP 404-405)

Clearly, the fraudulent unfiled denial order, dated 6/3/22, with a phony excuse for denial for the motion to reopen and dismiss, was planned to never surface in the Dare County Courthouse. Previous fraudulent OKTs have been stolen from William J Buffo III's home, during illegal arrests.

What Judge Taylor fails to mention on her denial to the defendants motion to withdraw plea, is that she secretly mailed out a phony excuse denying the motion to replea & dismiss, dated 6/3/22, didn't file it in either case 20cf2667 or 20cm2222, and provided an update with orders for the State and herself pertaining to the motion to withdraw plea.

The fraudulent unfiled denial, is now filed in the defendants ultimate motion for relief & dismissal under WI STATS § 806.07, 971.10(1), & 971.10(2) as Dkt 229 in 20cf2667 pages 15 & 16; APP 381 & 382

The ultimate motion for relief & dismissal under WI STATS § 806.07, 971.10(1), & 971.10(2) was filed with 4 Affidavits proving efile/clerk FRAUD with the multiple fraudulent rejection of motions submitted for filing email notices. The entire Gov't especially the less decorated, lower ranked employees try to take the documented FRAUD hit away from the completely FRAUDULENT Judges in Dane County Courthouse and in the State of Wisconsin. In this case, the clerk deliberately tried to push the filing of the ultimate motion outside of the 1 year window that relief under WI STAT § 806.07(1)(a)(c) brings for FRAUD on the Court, DA, & others!

What else Judge Taylor fails to mention regarding this unfiled denial is the non legal justification she provides for denying the motion to reopen & dismiss. Judge Taylor puts forth the following statements: "You allege that a dismissal of the action is warranted because your speedy trial requests were exceeded. There were no speedy trial demands received in your cases. You allege that you attempted to file such demand on May 7th, 2021, but I denied your request. I believe what occurred on that date was that you attempted to file seventy seven pages of documents. Given that you were represented by an attorney who electronically files documents, the documents were not received, but returned to your attorney for e-filing. No request for request for a speedy trial in either of your cases was ever filed with the Court."
(DKt 229, 2nd paragraph on page 15 in 20cf2667; APP 381)

Judge Taylor obviously just argued for failure of assistance of counsel on her fraudulent unfiled denial. Hence, why it couldn't be included on her fraudulent denial for the motion to withdraw plea (DKt 243, last sentence on page 1 through the rest of the introduction on page 2; APP 404-405)

When William J Buffo III picked up the denied filings, containing his speedy trial violation/demand and motion to dismiss that totaled 77 pages of documents, with 2 cover pages, he asked his failure of attorney to file them again. Nathan Otis refused to file these documents through efile, originally and that is why William J Buffo III filed them traditionally at the courthouse on 5/7/21, and subsequently Judge Taylor denied the filing of them. The old Courthouse and Defense attorney Fraud tag team!

The cover page that was stamped "filed" and "received" with the stamp "filed on 5/7/21" crossed off and note proving judge Taylor denied the filing of these 77 documents from 20cf2667 on 5/11/21 and speedy trial violation/demands was included in William J Buffo III's motion to reopen & dismiss (DKt 204, pages 4 & 5 in 20cf2667; APP 350-351) and motion to withdraw plea (DKt 203 pages 10 & 11 in 20cf2667; APP 342-343)

Outside of the fact it took 4 days between William J Buffo III's documents being stamped received and stamped filed on 5/7/21, to deny the filing of the filing of the speedy trial violation/demands and motion to dismiss with factual attachments on 5/11/21, the non-legal

justification from Judge Taylor that she put on the unfiled denial is completely disproven with the facts that William J Buffo III submitted documents for filing on 4/7/21 and 5/28/21, they were filed, and Nathan Otis was retained as his attorney. [DKt 32 in 20cf2667; App 5-136] was filed 4/7/21 and got labeled "documents filed by the defendant." William also submitted a motion to modify bond conditions on 5/28/21 as [DKt 44 in 20cf2667; App 139-141]

On both 4/7/21 and 5/28/21, attorney Nathan Otis was retained. The notice of retainer for attorney Nathan Otis was filed on 10/27/20 as (DKt 9 in 20cf2667; App 4). The stipulation and order to withdraw for Nathan Otis were filed on 6/1/21 as (DKt 43 in 20cf2667; App 137-138)

The previous 2 paragraphs completely disproves Judge Taylor's non-legal justification/cover up excuse as to why she denied the filing of the speedy trial violation/demands and motion to dismiss on 5/11/21.

The fact that William J Buffo III was filing his own motions for dismissal, speedy trial violations/demands, bond modifications, videos, pictures, text messages, emails,

and documents while Nathan Otis was retained proves Nathan Otis' performance to be more than deficient. But for the courts and counsels deliberate actions, the cases would have been dismissed, gone to trial, or been dismissed before the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21. Judge Taylor would have been forced to dismiss the cases due to the states failure to bring the defendendant to trial within 90 days from the denied filing of the defendants speedy trial violation/demands on 5/7/21. (Speedy trial violation/demands were the first document within the 77 pages of documents following the 2 cover pages from 5/7/21 that Judge Taylor denied the filings of (Dkt 204, page 5 in 20cf2667; APP 351 [Motion to reopen & dismiss] and Dkt 203, page 11 in 20cf2667; APP 343). THIS PROVES HOW BADLY William S Buffo III wanted to GO TO TRIAL and how desperate Attorney Nathan Otis & Judge Taylor were willing to conduct fraudulent actions to prevent trial!

This meets the Strickland v. Washington 2-part test Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. Code 668, 104 S. Ct 2052 (1984)

State v James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct App. 1993)

A contract the defendant had with attorney Nathan Otis proves Nathan Otis signed to perform actions, with documentation, to get cases dismissed and the life threatening GPS off of his leg on 5/12/21. These actions also included filing his speedy trial violation demand and motion to dismiss that Judge Taylor denied the filings of.

Nathan Otis failed to perform any of the outlined contractual actions, with necessary documentation, to counter the courts deliberate actions to not be fair and impartial.

This proves that the court and attorney Nathan Otis were in collaboration of not providing any assistance that slightly resembled the duties of the Court or the job title of Defense Attorney.

The court, specifically Judge Taylor, denying filings that attorney Nathan Otis refused to file would prove there is a manifest injustice.

State v. James, 176 Wis. 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct. App. 1993)

This also proves that William J. Buffo III was denied the effective assistance of counsel. The contract that attorney Nathan Otis signed was attached to the motion to withdraw plea (Okt 203 page 6 in 20cf2667; APP 338)

This meets the Strickland v. Washington 2-part test Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)

On the denial order for withdraw of plea, Judge Taylor states, "On the ineffective assistance of counsel claims, Mr. Buffo alleges, among other things, that his trial attorneys should have filed dismissal motions and demanded trials. Mr. Buffo sets forth no material facts that would support a dismissal motion in his cases nor does he allege the likelihood of success of such a motion." (Okt 243 page 9, 2nd paragraph in 20cf2667; APP 412)

Obviously, Judge Taylor conveniently forgets the facts on the signed affidavit and chooses to ignore the facts of her denying the filing of the speedy trial violation/demands and motion to dismiss from 5/7/21, on the unfiled denial order dated 6/3/22.

If Judge Taylor returned the speedy trial

violation/demands and motion to dismiss to attorney Nathan Otis to e-file, that would prove this statement wrong on the withdrawal of plea denial.

The question it should have raised in her mind is why didn't Nathan Otis e-file the documents that she denied William J. Buffalo III from filing, if the reason of returning the documents to attorney Nathan Otis to e-file, justified her denial of them?

This meets the Strickland v. Washington 2 part test Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)

State v. Jones, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct App 1993)

Judge Taylor states, "Even if Mr. Buffalo's trial attorneys had filed motions to dismiss, they would have been unsuccessful. The test under Wisconsin law regarding the sufficiency of a complaint "is one of 'minimal adequacy,' not in a hyper technical but in a common sense evaluation, when setting forth the essential facts establishing probable cause (DKt 243 page 10, 2nd paragraph in 20082667; APP 413)

Whether the complaint is one of 'minimal adequacy' is completely

irrelevant when determining if a speedy trial violation/demands or motion to dismiss outlining the speedy trial violation would have been successful or unsuccessful.

The speedy trial violation/demands and motion to dismiss reads as follows (Dkt 204 page 5 in 20cf2667; APP 351 [motion to dismiss] and Dkt 203 page 11 in 20cf2667; APP 343 [motion to withdraw Plea]):

William J Buffo III files this Speedy trial demand in writing and would show into the court the following:

That cases 20cf2667 & 20cm2222 have not been set for trial.

It is in the defendant's best interest and is his Constitutional right that these cases are set for trial within the next 90 days.

William J Buffo III's 6th Amendment of the US Constitution, Article I, Section 7 of the WI constitution and WI STAT 971.10(2)(a) have been violated in 20cf2667. He has orally demanded his speedy trial right countless times that never gets recorded, filed at Dane County Courthouse, or mentioned on CCAP. He asked multiple defense attorneys to file motions of dismissal for violation of speedy trial and they refused. The US Attorneys office was not in compliance with 18 US Code Statute 3161(b), by failing to file a

criminal complaint within 30 days after the defendants arrest for case 20cm2222 from 6/25/20. This was originally a Federal case. It was switched to a state case to file the complaint and still be able to be prosecuted. The complaint was filed on 10/16/20 and the initial appearance held on 10/20/20. The 6th Amendment of the US Constitution, Article I section 7 of the WI constitution, and WI STAT 971.10 (1) for William J Buffo III have been violated in case 20cm2222. The District Attorneys office failed to bring William J Buffo III to trial within 60 days after his initial appearance in Dane County Courthouse.

wherefore premises considered, the Defendant requests that this Court enter its ORDER setting these cases for trial hearing, at the earliest possible date, pursuant to the Defendants 6th Amendment right of the US Constitution, Article I section 7 of the WI Constitution, and WI STATS § 971.10 (2)(a) & 971.10(1).

This speedy trial violation/demands was submitted for filing on May 7th, 2021, signed by William J Buffo III with an address of 6649 Odans Rd Madison WI 53719.

The Initial Appearance was supposedly held on 10/20/20 for case 20cm2222, which was the release date per the

fabricated cash bond signed filed 10/20/20 (Dkt 6
in case 20cm2222; APP 435-436)

The motion to dismiss with attachments, submitted for
filing on 5/7/21, that Judge Taylor denied the filing
of, outlines and proves dismissal of case 20cm2222
was inevitable, had it been filed by William J
Buffo III or an attorney (Dkt 203 page 12 in
20cf2667; APP 344 [motion to withdraw plea])

The denied filing of the motion for speedy trial violation/
demands and the motion to dismiss by Judge Taylor,
submitted for filing by William J Buffo III on 5/7/21,
that attorney Nathan Otis refused to file, would
have dismissed both cases prior to the forced
plea hearing on 8/27/21, due to the state failing
to take William J Buffo III to trial within 90
days of the demand. The other certainty is
that case 20cf2667 would have been scheduled
and gone to trial, had the speedy trial
violation/demand stayed filed at Dare County
Courthouse.

There is no doubt that both the speedy trial
violation/demands and/or the motion to dismiss
with attachments would have dismissed case 20cm2222

for violation of speedy trial on 5/7/21

"[a] defendant must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the withdrawal of plea is necessary to correct a manifest injustice."

State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230 236-237 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct. App 1993)

This also meets the Strickland v. Washington 2 part test
Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668 104 S Ct 2052 (1984)

William J. Buffo III sent attorney Nathan Otis an email that stated he wanted to represent himself because Nathan Otis failed to perform any actions that were in his best interest. This email was sent after Nathan Otis refused to file these documents again, that should have never been denied to be filed and returned to him by Judge Taylor.

At this point, attorney Nathan Otis was in breach of the 5/12/21 contract. He wasn't just lying verbally like all government and private party colluders do on a regular basis.

William J. Buffo III asked for the Vest Cam footage of the Middleton Police Department officers, the FBI camera footage, and the camera footage from the building located at 8215 Greenway Blvd Middleton, WI 53562. This is the address of the building that the corrupt FBI rents an office in. This camera footage would clear the fraudulent criminal complaint filed by the District Attorneys Office for case 20cm2222. The vest cam footage from the Waukegan Police Department was also requested

from attorney Nathan Otis. The vest cam footage would clear the fraudulent complaint filed by the District Attorneys office for case 20cm2222.

Attorney Nathan Otis replied to William J Buffalo III's email that requested all camera footage pertaining to both 20cf2667 and 20cm2222, plus requiring attorney Nathan Otis to withdraw on 5/13/21.

On 5/13/21, Nathan Otis replied with; "William, I believe you will find most, if not all of this, on the thumb drive. However, Middleton Police Department and Dane County Sheriffs office do not have body cameras."

The thumb drive he provided William J Buffalo III had no videos on it from Middleton Police Department, the FBI camera, or from the building that the FBI rents an office in. The subject of the email Nathan Otis replied to, with these bold faced lies regarding video discovery is titled [Police vest cams / FBI camera] (DKt 203 bottom of page 8 with ~~APP~~ next to the time stamp and page 9 in 20cf2667; APP 340-341)

It took Attorney Nathan Otis from being Notified to withdraw as counsel on 5/13/21, until 6/1/21 to actually file a withdrawal of counsel motion / proposed order. (DKt 43 in 20cf2667; APP 137-138)

This clearly proves that Judge Taylor and Attorney Nathan Otis were collaborating to stonewall the filing of the speedy trial violation demands & motion to dismiss.

On 7/16/21, William J Buffo III replies via email with "Middleton Police Department has worn body/vest cameras for quite some time." A link to the Middleton Police Department website and a news article. These website links have facts printed beneath the hyperlink to the Middleton Police Department and news articles that state, "body worn cameras have been received and have been distributed to ALL Middleton Patrol officers, as of March 2017." (OKt 203 Middle of page 8 to almost the bottom of page 8 in 20cf2667; APP 340)

On 7/16/21, attorney Nathan Otis replies with "I provided you with a Zip drive containing an entire copy of your file (including all documents you previously provided to me). I have provided the same to your new attorney. As your new attorney, he is able to obtain any and all evidence (including any video evidence) that exists in any of your cases. Any further questions about what such evidence exists needs to be directed to him." (OKt 203 top of page 8 in 20cf2667; APP 340)

This proves attorney Nathan Otis refused to provide the video/vest cam footage for cases 20cf2667 and 20cm2222 and didn't put them on the thumb drive he provided. William wouldn't have asked him again, needed to research when the Middleton Police Department started wearing vest cams, and sent him the links to disprove his bold faced lies to collude and cover up for all government involved.

Attorney Nathan Otis wouldn't have stated that attorney David Anderson "is able to obtain any and all evidence (including any video evidence) that exists in any of your cases," had he

provided all video evidence to William J Buffalo ~~III~~ or to attorney David Anderson.

This meets the Strickland v. Washington 2 part test Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. Code 668, 104, S. Ct. 2052 (1984)

State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W.2d 345, 348 (Ct App 1993)

On 7/16/21, William replies with "That wasn't my question. Did you provide all of the body camera evidence from the Middleton Police Department and the Dane County Sheriff's office to him?" (DKT 203, bottom of page 7 in 20cf2667; APP 339)

On 7/16/21, attorney Nathan Otis replies with "I provided all of the video evidence I had your new attorney." (DKT 203, middle of page 7 in 20cf2667; APP 339)

Neither attorney Nathan Otis nor "new attorney" David Anderson, would ever provide the video evidence or show it to William.

This meets the Strickland v. Washington 2 part test Strickland v. Washington, 466 Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)

State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct App 1993)

On 7/16/21, attorney David Anderson, who was carbon copied in on all of this email chain, replies with "I am happy to "discuss" all of these requests at our meeting this afternoon." (DKT 203 Top of page 7 in 20cf2667; APP 339)

Attorney David Anderson backed out attorney Nathan Otis because

he was caught lying about the Middleton Police Department not wearing vest cams. All attorneys want to "verbally talk" about everything, so their bold faced lies aren't caught in writing.

Both attorneys Nathan Otis & David Andersons failure to represent William J Buffo III honestly, their ineffective assistance are proven by not producing or sharing actual case details/evidence, and outright covering for the actions of the government and the courthouse, especially the denied filings by Judge Taylor that would have dismissed both cases or to trial before the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21, prove complete failure of counsel and manifest injustice.

Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)
State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W.2d 345, 348 (Ct App 1993)

The only reasons that William J Buffo III retained attorney David Anderson was because of the inability to get a single response from the corrupt ADA Tracy McMiller and to force release from the 8th illegal arrest from Dane County Jail. Judge Taylor indirectly admits to the 26 day illegal jailing that she issued the warrant for. (OKT 202 in 20cf2667; APP 332)

Attorney David Anderson signed a contract on 7/23/21 to perform specific actions. The contract included an itemized inventory of documents that attorney Nathan Otis should have provided to him already. (OKT 203 pages 3 and 4 in 20cf2667; APP 335-336)

Actions David Anderson signed to perform include the following (OKT 203 bottom of page 4 in 20cf2667; APP 336)

1. Documents that still needing to be provided to attorney

David Anderson that he already should have been provided to him by attorney Nathan Otis.

2. Provide William J Buffo III with a written plea offer
3. File motions to dismiss
4. Update William J Buffo III on communication with ADA McMiller

Attorney Nathan Otis failed to provide the documents William had provided to attorney David Anderson despite the documented email chain displayed earlier. William had to provide all the items on Dkt 203 pages 3 & 4 in 20cf2667; APP 335-336 to attorney David Anderson and force him to sign the contract that he was provided copies.

Obviously, the most important documents that needed to be provided to attorney David Anderson were the denied filings from 5/7/21 that would have dismissed both cases, brought them to trial, or dismissed them prior to the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21, for the State failing to bring William to trial within 90 days of 5/7/21. The speedy trial violation/demands would have been filed 5/7/21, had Judge Taylor and attorney Nathan Otis deny/refuse assistance in obtaining it to be filed.

Attorney David Anderson signed a contract to provide William with updates on communication with ADA McMiller which he did not follow through with.

Attorney David Anderson signed a contract to file motions to dismiss, which he did not file any dismissal motions.

The only action that attorney David Anderson performed on the 2 page written contract was that he provided the States

written plea offer. Unfortunately, attorney David Anderson didn't provide the States written plea offer until after the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21. Attorney David Anderson provided the States written plea offer on 8/30/21.

Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct. 2052 (1984)
 State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct App. 1993)

Attorney David Anderson refused to file a motion to withdraw plea on William J Buffo III's behalf, which was immediately being asked of him after the completely fraudulent and forced plea hearing. David Anderson also refused to sign a contract to file a motion to withdraw the plea that Judge Tzyler, David Anderson, and ADA McMiller forced on William.

William J Buffo III emailed attorney David Anderson countless times between 8/27/21 & 9/7/21 with no response from him.

William J Buffo III filed a motion to withdraw the judgments of conviction & ask Judge Tzyler to reconsider the actions that took place on 8/27/21. He filed a motion for withdrawal of judgment of convictions on 9/7/21 because attorney David Anderson refused to respond to William's requests to assist him.
 (OKT 98 in 20 of 2667; APP 153-187)

The motion filed on 9/7/21, was a far inferior motion to withdraw plea than the current motion to withdraw plea that Judge Tzyler denied without an evidentiary hearing.

A hearing notice was filed for this inferior version of motion to withdraw judgments of conviction (OKT 109 in 20 of 2667; APP 188). Hearing date got scheduled for 10/13/21.

The motion to withdraw the judgment of convictions filed 9/7/21, outlined how nothing was properly conducted leading up to the plea hearing, during the plea hearing, and immediately after the plea hearing. This motion was supported with factual documentation attached to it.

The motion stated that ADA McMiller provided a written plea offer for both cases to be guaranteed for 1-week. written plea offer from ADA Tracy McMiller (OKt 98 page 24 in 20cf2667; APP 176). The guaranteed 1-week written plea offer was not incorporated and filed with the judgment of convictions on 8/30/21. The judgments of conviction did not state the written plea offer was good for 1 week (OKt 96 in 20cf2667; APP 150-152; OKt 91 in 20cm2222; APP 4137-4138). Hence, the defendant couldn't return back to the status he should have remained at, after the forced plea hearing, not guilty and expecting to go to trial.

This motion correctly outlines the factual events that took place during the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21. He never pled guilty to committing any of the counts at the fraudulent plea hearing.

ADA Tracy McMiller, attorney David Andersen, and judge Christine Taylor forced a guilty plea onto William J Buffalo III to protect the bold faced lying government, especially the FBI. All government was conducting FRAUD and still is! Neither case existed, William J Buffalo III was FRAMED.

William J Buffalo III was threatened by Judge Taylor during this fraudulent plea hearing and forced to accept the guilty plea

the others made for him that day.

The exact words out of William J. Buffalo III's mouth ranged from "I have to plead guilty in order to enter a plea option," "I have to plead guilty because I'd like to move on," "My plea is a plea option," "I have to plead guilty to get the life threatening GPS device off my leg," "I have to plead guilty in order to get this moving forward in my life from what I understand, based on how things have gone!" (DKt 98 page 2, 1st paragraph; APP: 154 & DKt 203; APP 334)

Judge Taylor reiterated "I understand you want to move forward in your life, but I can't take your plea that way," "I won't accept a plea from somebody who does not really think they committed the charge, it's not ethical or legal for me to take a plea that way!" (DKt 98, page 2, 1st paragraph; APP: 154 & DKt 203; APP 334)

Judge Taylor admits to Fraud, knowing that all involved will cover for her criminal actions!

ADA McMiller suggests: "we could possibly ask him what he did to do this; I've heard that... Maybe that would get closer to what we want him to say!" (APP 154 & 334)

Due to the amount of FRAUD conducted by all authorities/Gov't, the FBI has needed the court reporters to collude and submit fraudulent transcripts for the hearing dates to cover for Judge Taylor, ADA McMiller, and both attorneys Nathan Otis and David Anderson. This is exactly why the FACTS SPEAK and transcripts were requested to not be needed on the statement on transcripts. William requested video/audio transcripts

from the records department at the Dane County Courthouse. The records Department claims there is no audio and visual records for the hearing dates requested. (OKt 254 pages 4-6; App: 432-434) Dane County court would only "verbally lie" they didn't exist...!

If audio and visual records were accessible, it would be clear that case 20cm2722 was never even mentioned in a hearing until 2021, when case 20cf2667 wasn't looking promising for the fraudulent District Attorneys Office.

The plea questionnaires were not filled out or signed by William J Buffo III. These plea questionnaires do not even contain his full legal name, address, email, or phone number written on them. (OKt 95 in 20cf2667; App: 148-149)

The signature page on the motion to withdraw the judgments of conviction proves to be a different signature than what attorney David K Anderson forged William J Buffo III's signature to be on the plea questionnaire that was filed at the Dane County Courthouse (OKt 98, page 3 in 20cf2667; App: 155)

The filed plea questionnaires were filled out in attorney David K Anderson's handwriting and his signature and license number on the signature page (OKt 95 in 20cf2667; App: 148-149)

William J Buffo III completed 18 years of schooling, attorney David Anderson wrote 16 years on the plea questionnaire.

Had William J Buffo III filled out the plea questionnaires, he would have checked the no contest box because he was not guilty.

The filed plea questionnaires do not include the 3rd page, which would have been the written plea offer that was guaranteed for 1-week, yet the box on page 2 is checked to see the attached plea agreement. (OKt 95, page 2 in 20cf2667; APP 149.)

It is clearly proven that the objective of attorney David K. Anderson was to collude in FRAUD with all government involved; not provide William J Buffo III with the 1-week guaranteed plea offer, and he didn't even ask William J Buffo III any questions that were on the plea questionnaire. Attorney David K Anderson just filled it out and signed for William J Buffo III, FRAUD! This completely disallowed William J Buffo III not to have the automatic option that the 1-week guaranteed written plea offer provided, which was to withdraw the plea to be withdrawn without anybody else's actions!

The only reason William J Buffo III attended the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21 and not participate is because the only other option was to have the fraudulent Judge Taylor issue another illegal warrant for his arrest!

Unfortunately for William J Buffo III, somehow a notice to withdraw a motion for withdrawal of JOE'S was filed on 9/24/21 (OKt 110 in 20cf2667; APP 189), through efile.

William J Buffo III had never submitted any documents through the efilings system until 12/22/21. William did not file a notice to withdraw a motion to withdraw the judgments of conviction. This notice has an electronic signature and anybody, especially the corrupt FBI/government

could have filed it to cheat William J Buffo III out of a much deserved trial to clear his name.

Therefore, William J Buffo III didn't get the opportunity to attend the 10/13/21 hearing to hear his motion to withdraw the judgments of conviction that would have resulted in the scheduling of a trial.

Strickland v Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct 2052 (1984)

State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (Ct App 1993)

The motion to withdraw plea, filed on 5/11/22 was far superior to the motion to withdraw the judgments of conviction. (DKt 203 in 20cf2667; App 333-346 [motion to withdraw plea])

This most recent motion to withdraw pleas outlined absolutely everything DKt 98 in 20cf2667 outlined, plus it added written verbiage explaining how and factually proving with attachments to motion attorneys Nathan Ctis and Joseph Fishers collusion in FRAUD to cover for the government. This motion also attached the cover sheet for the denied filing of William J Buffo III's Speedy trial violation/demands and motion to dismiss, submitted for filing on 5/7/11 (DKt 203 page 10 in 20cf2667; APP 342), Speedy trial violation/demands itself (DKt 203 pg 11 in 20cf2667; APP 343), and motion to dismiss, pages 12-14, APP 344-346).

Both contracts for attorneys David Anderson and Joseph Fisher proved they confirmed receiving 300 documents that Dare County Courthouse clerk stamped filed 6/8/21, yet none of these documents showed up as

filed documents in either case 20cf2667 or 20cm2222.
(DKt 203 in the bottom left hand corner of page 3 and
in the middle of page 5 in 20cf2667; APP 335 & 337)

Proof of documents stamped filed 6/8/21 that didn't
show up in either case, were filed in William J Buffalo
III's 1st "post conviction motion for relief and dismissal,
along with countless other documents that Judge Christine
Taylor should have honored relief and dismissal by
proving Fraud on the Court under WI STAT § 806.07(1)(c).
(DKt 119, pages 4 & 5 in 20cf2667; APP 205-206, DKt 123 pages
2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12-17 in 20cf2667; APP 270, 273, 276, 278, 280
through 285, DKt 125 pages 5-15 in 20cf2667; APP 308 - 318)

Proof of documents not showing up as filed documents
on 6/8/21 were filed as screen shots from efile of
both cases and by Laura Nachazel from records,
the Court Manager at the Corrupt Dane County Courthouse.

Screenshots from e-file of both cases proving the
stamp filed 6/8/21 documents discredited (DKt 122,
pages 19 & 20 in 20cf2667; APP 267-268)

Laura Nachazel from records, the court manager at Dane
County courthouse, states that there were filed
documents by William J Buffalo III on 6/8/21. Laura
Nachazel filed this statement during the open cases,
proved fraud within the employees at Dane County
Courthouse that denied William J Buffalo III his
constitutional right to file documents.

On the 2nd to last sentence of Laura Nachazel's

filed statement, she states; "I reviewed the documents you filed, these documents were not with anything that you filed today, June 8, 2021" (OKt 66 page 1 20cf 2667; App 142)

William J Buffo III filed this statement in both 20cf2667 and 20cm2222 again in multiple motions for relief and dismissed under HI STAT § 806.07(1)(c), which clearly proves FRAUD on the court and should have achieved such (OKt 122 page 15 in 20cf2667; APP 263)

Judge Christine Taylor ignores the factually proven FRAUD again, outlining these denied filings when she denies the "Revised Motion for Relief & Dismissal" (OKTS 119-125 in 20cf2667; APP 190-323)

Correct order to read the motion with attachments is its numbered in the upper right hand corner 1-134 [Judge Taylor should be Fired & Jailed]

Judge Taylor's Fraudulent Denial of OKTS 119-125 in 20cf2667; APP 190-323, is filed only in case 20cf 2667 as OKt 161, on 3/3/22; APP 325-331

With attorneys David Anderson and Joseph Fisher having signed contracts confirming 300 documents stamped filed 6/8/21 and Dane County Courthouse not filing them in either case, they should have obtained dismissal by filing motions or an appeal.

Motions to dismiss proving FRAUD on the court, make Judge Christine Taylor's statements on her denial of motion to withdraw plea, erroneous! (OKt 243 page 9, 1st sentence of 2nd paragraph 20cf2667, APP 412)

Judge Taylor's erroneous statement is; "Even if Mr. Buffo's trial attorneys had filed motions to dismiss, they would have been unsuccessful" (OK+ 243 page 1st sentence of 2nd paragraph in 20cf2667; APP 413)

Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct 2052 (1984)
State v. James, 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500, N.W. 2d 395 398 (Ct App 1993)

Attorney Joseph Fisher signed a contract with William S Buffo III on 11/17/21, to perform certain actions, which appear above and below his signature in the middle of the page (OK+ 203 middle of page 5 in 20cf2667; APP 346)

These actions that attorney Fisher signed to perform, include the following:

- 1) File a media request for hearings
- 2) Provide the chronological order of the appeal process in getting cases dismissed
- 3) Motion to modify probation conditions by 11/27/21 w/ exhibits
- 4) File an appeal by the end of the week (by 11/19/21)
- 5) Appeal will be filed and based upon the denied filings that would have dismissed both cases, had they been filed on 5/7/21 and clerk of court stamped filed documents from 6/8/21 that never showed up in either case.
- 6) file motions to reopen and dismiss under WI STATS § 806.07, 971.10(1), & 971.10(2) for judge Taylor's denied filing of William S Buffo III's speedy trial violation/demands
- 7) File a motion to withdraw plea

Attorney Joseph Fisher failed to perform any of these actions that he signed a contract to accomplish.

The fact that attorney Joseph Fisher failed to file a motion to dismiss, a motion to appeal, a motion to modify fraudulent probation conditions with exhibits (all with facts proving abuse of discretion of a judge & prosecuterized misconduct / Fraud - for prosecuting a fraudulent discovery), or even provide William J Buffalo III with the chronological order of an appeals process, it allowed him not to have to file a media request. The hearings to file a media request should have existed if he had provided any of the other 5 actions he signed to perform.

Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 S. Ct 2052 (1984)
State v. James, 176, Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (ct App 1993)

Attorney Fisher just decided to join the government colluders circle of FRAUD by withdrawing for absolutely no reason. This clearly is proof of ineffective assistance of counsel and the biggest manifest injustice, documented in the United States Court system history!

After withdrawing as counsel, Attorney Joseph Fisher emailed William J Buffalo III on 12/9/21.

This email contained a 2 sentence statement by Attorney Fisher. He states; "There are clearly cases that exist where the courts have applied WE STAT 806.07 to criminal cases. If your lawyers did not look that up, perhaps you need to meet with different lawyers." (DKT 143 in case 20cf2667; App 324)

This statement from Attorney Fisher should prove that the motion to reopen and dismiss, filed 5/11/22, would be

successful in any courthouse, heard by any Judge! (DKT 204) in 20cf2667; APP 347-351.)

The unfiled denial order to the motion to reopen and dismiss, dated 6/3/22, only mailed to William J Buffo III's house, Judge Taylor only states complete lies & phony excuses. (DKT 229, pages 15 & 16 in 20cf2667; APP 381-382). The only reason it is filed at the Dane County Courthouse is because William J Buffo III filed it within his 3rd motion for relief and dismissal under WI 806.07, 971.10(1), and 971.10(2).

Judge Taylor dishonestly states; "You allege that a dismissal of the action is warranted because your speedy trial requests were exceeded. There were no speedy trial demands received in your cases. You allege that you attempted to file such demand on 5/7/21, but I denied your request. I believe what occurred on that date was that you attempted to file seventy seven pages of documents. Given that you were represented by attorney who electronically files documents, the documents were not received, but returned to your attorney to e-file. No request for a speedy trial in either of your cases was ever filed with the court."

These lies have already been completely disproven with William J Buffo III filing DKT 32; APP 5-136, labeled "documents filed by the defendant" and DKT 44 APP 139-141, a bond modification motion signed by William J Buffo III. Both documents were filed while Attorney Nathan Otis was retained. Notice of retainer filed 10/27/20 (DKT 9 in 20cf2667, APP 4) and Nathan Otis stipulation & withdraw 6/1/20 (DKT 43 in 20cf2667, APP 137-138)

William J Buffalo III would have had his speedy trial violation/demands for both 20cf2667 & 20cm2222 filed on 5/7/21, had Judge Taylor not fraudulently denied the filing of it.

State v. James 176 Wis 2d 230, 236-237, 500 N.W. 2d 345, 348 (ct App 1993)

Judge Taylor also puts forth the fraudulent statement on this unfiled denial of "Further, as I previously set forth in my 3/3/22, Decision & order, by creating Wis Stats 974.02 and 974.06, the legislature has provided the PRIMARY statutory means of post conviction relief for criminal defendants with State v. Henley, 2010 WI 97, 328 Wis 2d 544, 787 N.W. 2d 350. (DKt 229, page 15 in 20cf2667; APP 381)

Judge Taylor deliberately ignores the only denied filing, proven to have been her actions which caused the denied filing, and had she not denied the filing of the speedy trial violation/demands motion, William J Buffalo III would have gone to trial prior to the forced plea hearing, or the cases would have been dismissed due to the State failing to take William J Buffalo III to trial, within 90 days from 5/7/21. Again, this is proven in DKt 204 in 20cf2667; APP 347-351. This proves WI STAT § 806.07(1)(c) to cover why a fraudulent denied filing of such importance would justify relief & dismissal.

Judge Taylor's reference to State v. Henley, 2010 WI 97, 328 Wis 2d 544, 787 NW 2d 350 proves that she has no legal argument for denial of denied filings or documented FRAUD in DKt 161 in 20cf2667; APP 325-331). This case law only pertains to denying motions for relief in criminal cases under WI Stats § 806.07(1)(g)(h). It doesn't cover relief in a criminal case under WI Stat 806.07(1)(c).

On this 6/3/22 unfiled denial order, only mailed to William J. Burff III's house, that is now filed as Dkt 229 page 15; APP 381) Judge Taylor concludes with "In regard to your May 11, 2022 motion to withdraw plea based on ineffective assistance of counsel, I have given the State 2 weeks to file a response. UPON THAT FILING, I WILL DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE SCHEDULING OF A HEARING.

This leads anybody to believe that the motion to withdraw plea would be scheduled for a hearing. Obviously, it was not scheduled appropriately and it was even deserved in her opinion.

Two weeks from 6/3/22, is 6/17/22. The States response was filed in place of this unfiled denial, on 7/1/22 (Dkt 207 in 20cf2667; APP 352-365). Screenshots of the States response being filed in exchange of the 6/3/22 unfiled denial order were filed in the ultimate motion for relief and dismissal (Dkt 230 pages 142 in 20cf2667; APP 383-384).

This proves the Court didn't want the phony non-legal based excuse put forth on the denial to be seen by others, especially the public. This also proves that the state took an extra 13 days beyond the deadline to come up with their fraudulent response against the motion to withdraw plea filed 5/11/22.

Judge Taylor should have disregarded the States response all together and just scheduled a trial date for failure to comply with the two-week deadline or at least sanctioned them.

Judge Taylor is acting more than just "In Favor of the State", she is acting as if she is "Head of State" with the

extreme breaks that she has extended to them for noncompliance of orders and prosecuting a fraudulent discovery.

Judge Taylor then drafts a letter to the court of Appeals and files it on 9/8/22 (DKT 227 in 20cf2667; APP 366), which is severely late regarding that 90 days from 5/11/22 is 8/9/22, 1 full month prior to filing for this extension.

"Somehow" the court of Appeals FitzPatrick, J does not catch the fact that both 20cf2667 & 20cm 2222 receive only 1 case number 22xx1081 in the court of Appeals, without Judge Taylors extension mentioning anything about Fitzpatrick, J's conclusion about both cases were heard as 1 case in the trial court. Conveniently this conclusion is filed by FitzPatrick J, after William J Buffalo III posted "even the appeals court is colluding with a screen shot of efile" on Facebook to pretend case 20cm 2222 ever existed in trial court!

The court of Appeals FitzPatrick, J filed the order to extend Judge Taylors Decision on the motion to withdraw plea until 9/30/22 (DKT 241 in 20cf2667; APP 402-403). on this order FitzPatrick, J ordered all attorneys who participated in electronic circuit court filing to get in to appellate efile within 5 days of the 9/12/22 order to do so. FitzPatrick J states "we remind counsel that failure to comply with an order of this court may be grounds for \$ or other sanctions. See Wis Stat 809.83(2). Attorneys Mark Eisenberg, Nathan Otis, & David Anderson have still yet to comply with this order, 7 months later.

The court of Appeals then provided 2 separate case

numbers, once William J Buffalo III filed the notice of appeal into both cases 20cf2667 and 20cm2222. This is because it covered further for case 20cm2222 never existing, wanted to combat William J Buffalo III's facebook post proving all government involved (now the court of appeals) is covering for FBI, Dane County Courthouse, DA's office & US Attorneys Office, but it covered an extra filing fee for William J Buffalo III. If the WI DOC couldn't fraudulently keep issuing illegal warrants to jail William J Buffalo III, so the FEDS could steal the biggest collection of documented FRAUD of Gov't of ALL levels from his residence, Child support of WI could issue an illegal warrant for failure to pay. Judges Ehlike & Everett, plus Commissioner Leggsdon made sure to collude to bankrupt William J Buffalo III, Jack up his child support, and never reduce it to an accurate amount despite proving different within filed documents!!!

* Conclusion

The Defendant clearly meets the 2-part test for Strickland v. Washington, 466 US Code 668, 104 Ct 2052 (1984), proving severe and deliberate ineffective assistance of counsel, and the

biggest manifest injustice, documented within the cases already, in the history of the United States criminal justice system, especially in the State of Wisconsin.

"[a] defendant must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the withdrawal of plea is necessary to correct a manifest injustice."

State v James, 176 Wis 2d 230 236-237 500 N.W
2d 345, 348 (Ct. App. 1993)

William J Buffo III needed to file his own motions for dismissal, speedy trial violations/demands, notice of appeal, documents, videos, pictures, text messages, emails, and bond modifications while attorneys Nathan Otis, David Andersen, and Joseph Fischer were retained. He needed to have written contracts with these 3 attorneys to perform actions which they clearly refused to perform.

Had these 3 attorneys performed any of the agreed upon contractual actions, it would have greatly influenced a different outcome for these cases, other than the forced plea hearing.

When William J Buffo III tried to file most all the pleadings and documents that would have dismissed the open cases or taken them to trial, the court didn't show them as filed or Judge Teyler outright fraudulently denied the filing of them. Then Judge

Taylor returned them to the attorney retained, and attorney Nathan Otis refused to file the documents again.

The denied filing of the motion for speedy trial violation/demands, submitted for filing on 5/7/21, stamped filed 5/7/21, then the filed stamp subsequently crossed off, returned to Nathan Otis who refuses to file again electronically, would have dismissed both cases prior to the forced plea hearing on 8/27/21 for failure of the State to bring William J Buffo III to trial within 90 days of the filing date. 90 days from 5/7/21 is 8/9/21 and the day the State would have violated speedy trial rights. The only other option is that trial would have been scheduled and participated in, prior to the forced plea hearing.

William J Buffo III deserves a withdrawal of plea so he can get his day in court, without the ineffective assistance of counsel and the court standing in his way. He looks forward to having a fair and biased trial that William J Buffo III will end up victorious due to an impartial jury!

The other deserved outcome is relief and dismissal for a reversal of denial order of motion to reopen & dismiss (OKT 204 in 20cf2667; APP 347-351). William J Buffo III deserves both!

The Court of Appeals will chose to reverse the only fraudulent filed denial order of the motion to reopen and dismiss, which is relief, dismissal/expunge! (Ort 243 n 20cf2667; App 404-428)! This will save face for all government involved at a trial that will be deliberately avoided, again. Also, the trial that will be avoided, would have had the media requested to attend. The newest presiding official would have denied the request, given the court of Appeals take action with this correct decision!

Please reopen & dismiss both 20cf2667 & 20cm2222 release or schedule the much deserved trial date and William J Buffalo III on bond, pending trial!

Submitted for filing 4/8/23

William J Buffalo III

William J Buffalo III

Still illegally being jailed @ One County Jail, due to the Court of Appeals fraudulently denying his motions for bond, pending slam dunk Appeals!

115 W Doty St Madison WI

53703

Bond Masters for release
 Meet every piece of
 WI STAT 809.31 & 809.14
 criteria - The FRAUD
 CONTINUES w/
 PEDS CONTROLLING Presiding
 Officials to honor nothing
 but cover up for the
 broken system!

5) INDEX OF Document NUMBERS AND NAMES CITED IN APPEAL BRIEF

Documents From Case 20cf2667 Cited

| DKT NUMBER | NAME OF DOCUMENT | ON PAGES OF APPEAL BRIEF | APPENDIX PAGES |
|------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 9 | Notice of Retainer | 15, 39 | 4 |
| 32 | Documents filed by Defendant | 15, 39 | 5 - 136 |
| 43 | Stipulation & order to Withdraw | 15, 24, 39 | 137 - 138 |
| 44 | Motion to Modify Bond | 15, 39 | 139 - 141 |
| 66 | Letter from clerk Laura Nachazel | 36 | 142 - 147 |
| 95 | Plea questionnaire/Waiver of Rights | 30, 32, 33 | 148 - 149 |
| 96 | J.O.C. 20cf2667 | 30 | 150 - 152 |
| 98 | Def's Motion to withdraw J.O.C.'s | 29, 30-33 | 153 - 187 |
| 109 | Hearing Notice to withdraw J.O.C.'s | 29 | 188 |
| 110 | Fraudulent Effie signed Notice to w/D Moten to w/D J.O.C.'s | 33 | 189 |
| 120 | Revised Final Motion for relief & dismissal and to remove Conditions of Probation | 36 | 190 - 201 |
| 119 | Part 1 of final revised motion | 35, 36 | 202 - 226 |
| 121 | Part 2 of final revised motion | 36 | 227 - 248 |
| 122 | Part 3 of final revised motion | 35, 36 | 249 - 268 |
| 123 | Part 4 of final revised motion | 36 | 269 - 286 |
| 124 | Part 5 of final revised motion | 36 | 287 - 303 |
| 125 | Part 6 of final revised motion | 35, 36 | 304 - 323 |
| 143 | Email from Attorney Joseph Fischer that serves as Affidavit that WE STAT 806.07 works for relief in criminal cases | 38 | 324 |
| 161 | Judge Taylors Fraudulent denial w/ no legal argument that pertains to 806.07(i)(c) | 36, 40 | 325 - 331 |
| 202 | Judge Taylor admits illegal warrants/arrests | 27 | 332 |
| 203 | Motion to reopen & dismiss for denied filing of speedy trial violation/demand | 4, 10, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 24-28, 34, 35-37, 39 | 333 - 346 |
| 204 | Motion to w/D Plea Manifest Injustice & Failure of private attorneys | 3, 4, 7, 8-11, 14, 16 20, 40, 45 | 347 - 351 |
| 207 | State's Fraudulent Response to Plea w/D | 5, 41 | 352 - 365 |
| 227 | Extension by Judge Taylor (30 days late) | 42 | 366 |
| 229 | Portion of Ultimate Motion w/ unfiled fraudulent denial from Judge Taylor | 5, 12, 13, 39, 41 | 367 - 382 |

INDEX OF DOCUMENT NUMBERS AND NAMES
CITED IN APPEAL BRIEF CON'T.

Documents from Case 20cf2667 Cited

| DKT NUMBER | NAME OF DOCUMENT | ON PAGES OF APPEAL BRIEF | APPENDIX PAGES |
|------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|

| | | | |
|-----|---|----|-----------|
| 230 | Part of ultimate Motion that prays states Response filed in place of the fraudulent unfiled denial 7/1/22 | 41 | 383 - 401 |
|-----|---|----|-----------|

| | | | |
|-----|--|----|-----------|
| 241 | FITZPATRICK, J extension order proving colluding to cover for non-existent FBI (2nd case 20cm2222) (only 1 case # provided for both cases) and not questioning 30 days after deadline for order from fraudulent Judge Taylor (FEDS CONTROL COURT Brain dead/corrupt officials) | 42 | 402 - 403 |
|-----|--|----|-----------|

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 243 | only fraudulent filed denial regarding motions 203 (motion to wld plea & 204 (motion to reopen & dismiss 60 days late, filed on 9/30/22 | 4, 11, 13, 18, 19 36, 37, 46 | 404 - 428 |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|-----------|

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 254 | Audio/visual Auxiliary transcripts for 10/20/20 (Fake I/A for 20cm2222) & Forced/Fraudulent 8/27/21 plea hearing that William J Buffalo III never pled at! (Brief page 32) | 429 - 434 |
|-----|--|-----------|

DOCUMENTS FROM 20CM2222 CITED

| | | | |
|---|--|----|-----------|
| 6 | Cash bond signed that is how the fraudulent Dare County Courthouse stated I/A date for case 20 cm 2222 | 22 | 435 - 436 |
|---|--|----|-----------|

| | | | |
|----|----------------|----|-----------|
| 91 | J.O.C 20cm2222 | 30 | 437 - 438 |
|----|----------------|----|-----------|