STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN SUPREME COURT

Case No. 91-0923

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

KATHLEEN BRAUN,

Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner.

On Petition For Review Of A Decision Of The Court Of Appeals, District I, Affirming The Order Entered In The Circuit Court For Milwaukee County, The Honorable Ted E. Wedemeyer, Jr., Circuit Judge, Presiding

REPLY BRIEF OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT-PETITIONER

STEPHEN M. GLYNN
ROBERT R. HENAK
SHELLOW, SHELLOW & GLYNN, S.C.
222 East Mason Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 271-8535

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cases

Statutes

Other Authorities

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Plaintiff-Respondent

v.

KATHLEEN BRAUN

Defendant-Appellant

REPLY BRIEF OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

THE PROCEDURAL DISMISSAL OF MS. BRAUN'S ORIGINAL POST-VERDICT MOTION DOES NOT BAR [illegible]

The state [illegible] escaped first [illegible] second, by deny[illegible] under Wis. Stat. [illegible] prisoner inmate [illegible] see Wis. Stat. [illegible] Ortega-Rodriguez [illegible] & n.10 (199[illegible]

Finally, Ar[illegible] judicated" are [illegible] the structure [illegible] decisions in Ber[illegible]

N.W.2d 199 (1976

N.W.2d 694 (1974

court's post-ver

its, does not na

same constitut

203.[1]

Waiver

haphazard blend

missal only of

escape, and ba

any future rec

escape. See St

challenges [illegible]

motions[2] not

to a direct app

193 N.W.2d 88

requisite [illegible]

---

[1] The state do

ignores it. In a

pretation of §9

legislature. As

by this Court in

ate. See, e.g.

203 N.W.2d 666

tric Power Compa

(1968).

[2] Reliance up

necessary nor ap

context of §80

in criminal case

If it did apply

prosecution f

state objecti

law. See State

808, 816 (1980

That es [illegible] right to collateral [illegible] filed following [illegible] to dismiss a pen[illegible] imply the pow[illegible] claims of rel[illegible] to deny post[illegible] escape). The[illegible] §974.06(4) wh[illegible] a knowing an[illegible] 10-12

Ms [illegible] any collatera[illegible] issues in the [illegible] tunity to bea[illegible] Court has n[illegible] point. See W[illegible] N.W.2d 15[illegible] "[t]o relax th[illegible] sense and do[illegible] tion of jud[illegible] State v. Milash[illegible] (Ct. App. 19[illegible] 471 N.W.2d 4[illegible]

Cause And Prejudice [illegible] cases interpret[illegible] involving [illegible]

urges this C[illegible] ... ...

require Ms. B[illegible] ... ...e

"procedural defa[illegible] ... ... by

direct appeal ... ...

essary precond[illegible] ... ...

nor its underly[illegible] ... ...

Under ... ...

procedural defa[illegible] ... ...

poraneous ob[illegible] 33

U.S. 72 (1977) ... ...le

requiring all ... ...

appeal, Smith ... ...

Ross, 468 U.S. ... ...

as a matter of ... ...cal

Procedure §[illegible] ... ...

dure"). The f[illegible] ... ...

latter is f[illegible] ... ...

cedural rules ... ...

tional issues ... ...

tion under Wis[illegible] ... ...

erly have been ... ...

supra; Loop, sup[illegible]

Alth[illegible] ...

plete substi[illegible] ...

not every issue ... ...

appeal can a[illegible] ...

tion." Loop ...

limited to juris

e.g., State v. Ni

301 (Ct. App

fendant's right

li trial Th

not taken does

made later

Th

the federal

court's clear

right's feder

also account f

its rules and

ments an inte

court's were

the state

Criminal Proce

has no relev

own consti

not require a

has so held.

amended the st

ARBITRARY EXCLUSION

DENIED MS

is a violat[illegible] reversal. See [illegible] App. 1993) [illegible] mandated reve[illegible]

The [illegible] less stringen[illegible] sure is parti[illegible] ally hold that [illegible] tial closure [illegible] riding." See [illegible] But see State ex [illegible] 141 Wis. 2d [illegible] "compelling [illegible] state's case[illegible] may be requ[illegible] closure dampe[illegible] Douglas v. Wai[illegible] 1983) vacate[illegible] mand 739 [illegible] U.S. 1208 (198[illegible] (Alaska App. 1[illegible]

The [illegible] cause the ex[illegible] rectly conceded [illegible] was not justif[illegible]

Brief at 22-23

The

"received the

right despite the

22, apparently

analysis. How

prejudice from

Georgia, 46

sistent view

The same is

or complete

States ex rel

Cir. 1969); U

Cir. 1949)

(9th Cir.

fails to cite

---

3 Even the

"trivial" or

23, noted that

any new spect

courtroom dur

510 F.2d 224,

P.2d 954, 958

(1993). Both

required

limited

at 959.

4 Counsel ha

Reagan v. United

sequently was

for its illeg

State v. Burney

found no violat

but then stated

that the

698

Prejud

the public tri

analysis under

Fulminante

right is one

> "a crim
> its f
> ation
> crimi
> fundam

Id. (citatio

such a case

See Waller,

Nor d

argument in

at 25-28. C

the trial

proceeding

hearing, a

Waller, 46

State v. Webb

The previ

public. In

only in such

"proportion

not such a

The

porting its

stitutiona

closure during [illegible] the
fendant may [illegible] i.
Stevens, supra [illegible] p.
deed, the state [illegible] re
titions from [illegible] the
quately limit [illegible]
The state's m[illegible] -
See, e.g., Sta[illegible] 3
117 (1980) (i[illegible] a
cases), modifie[illegible]

The s[illegible] ..
at 30-37, als[illegible] the
relevant law [illegible]
cite ever[illegible]
to a public [illegible]
ly have be[illegible]
Waller, 467 [illegible] ne
reasonable a[illegible] m
or that ret[illegible] a
negative eff[illegible]
Waller simply [illegible]
lic trial rig[illegible]
quit or [illegible] ...er
would be fu[illegible]

---

5 Levine v. Un[illegible] ...ter
State's Brief [illegible]
analysis and [illegible]
harmless [illegible]

Lane, 489 U.S.

Even

very same imp

der impossibl

ing harmless

Dyess 124 W

beyond ba

state makes

PROSECUTORIAL M SCONDU
OF HER R

The

tion of Ms. B

amply rebutt

26-36. She w

Seymour

at the time

agreement

that suc

Nonetheless

trary (R4

quest for a

least a hea

the rec

N.W.2d

The

argue that

son time, Sta

The prosecut

bility of suc

evidence that

prison recomm

cess in consi

viewed by the

Bad Fa

section that

its bad fai

Brief at 4

States v. You

rejected such

counsel could

at 12. The i

misconduct del

in light of th

fense miscondu

Rebutta

that its b'a

of specula

6 The prosecut
reason he did
would contradi
argued to the
was not trying
state's judic
obligation to
Cf. Kellogg
N.W.2d 65, 68

sponses to de

jury to draw

ate. inference

call certain

be unfavorable

state is wr

A

appropriate wh

tionship betwe

the inferenc

fore the

cause." State

74 (1979)

of provin

fendant is

6054) and

the

an accompl

that defen

588(

90 N.W.2d

missing wit

MS

is demonstrated

The debate there

ONE

Ms. Braun asked

remand this case

P.O. ADDRESS

222 East Mason
Milwaukee, Wis
(414)

1043c