Analysis of Court Watch MKE's Reckless Driving Case Observations May 1, 2025 - October 31, 2025

Published January 12, 2026

*Judges issued more lenient sentences than the State recommendation **55%** of the time.*

Key Findings:

- **Judicial Leniency Trends:** Judicial sentences continue to be more lenient than the State's recommendations, though the gap is narrowing (55% compared to 69% in November of last year).
- **Overuse of Probation:** Probation is frequently imposed as a primary consequence, including for defendants with prior involvement in the criminal justice system. In the current reporting period, probation was granted 42% of the time.
- **Minimal Sentencing:** Both DA recommendations and judicial sentences are substantially lower than statutory maximums, despite most cases involving multiple charges with significantly higher total sentencing exposure.
- **Plea and Recommendation Practices:** Dismissed and read-in charges remain common in plea negotiations, often leading to minimal sentences and probation. The State increasingly leaves sentencing "up to the court," which effectively provides no meaningful recommendation.

Introduction

Since June 24, 2024, Enough is Enough (ENE) has monitored more than 1,100 criminal court hearings involving cases of fleeing or eluding law enforcement. This report analyzes sentencing outcomes in such cases across two consecutive five-month periods and one recent six-month period. Between May 1 and October 31, 2025, 335 cases with at least one charge of fleeing an officer proceeded to sentencing, and those outcomes are detailed in this report and its appendix.

The data was collected by ENE's Court Watch Program, a volunteer-run initiative that observes plea and sentencing hearings, documents proceedings, reviews defendants' criminal histories, and supports victims and the general public through Community Impact Statements submitted to the court. ENE tracks sentencing patterns to assess their effect on public safety and recidivism, emphasizing that sentences consistent with statutory intent are critical to accountability, deterrence, and reducing the harms associated with fleeing and reckless driving.

We appreciate and respect the tough job of a Judge who is expected to evaluate the complexity of each unique case and individual in front of them. We advocate for them to prioritize public safety, to understand their role toward influencing outcomes favoring the greater good and to the breadth of "tools" at their disposal via the guidelines of our laws.

Total docket of reckless driving cases

how ENE identifies them & how it has changed over time.

The Court Watch process involves systematically identifying, monitoring, and documenting court cases that include a charge of fleeing or eluding law enforcement. Using Wisconsin Circuit Court Access (CCAP), a master inventory of cases is maintained by searching relevant class codes and confirming the presence of a fleeing charge (statute 346.04). Cases are tracked throughout multiple stages of the court process—often over a year or more—and updated as they are resolved or dismissed.

Cases selected for observation are identified from judges' dockets, with priority given to plea and sentencing hearings and those where we are supporting a victim's family. Over time, refinements to case selection and observation methods have increased our coverage and efficiency. Even so, the weekly case volume and persistent rescheduling by the court continues to challenge our limited team. Often a full morning or afternoon of scheduled cases results in very few, if any actually being heard to completion.

The process also captures trends in case volume, delays, rescheduling, and outcomes, including related charges commonly sentenced alongside fleeing offenses. Persistent growth in new cases and prolonged resolution times underscore ongoing public safety concerns and resource challenges for victims, defendants, and the court system.

See the Appendix for specific data.

State legislature maximum sentences for (felony) reckless driving-related offenses

Per the Legislative Reference Bureau document "Felonies in the 2023–24 Wisconsin Statutes":

> *"In Wisconsin, there are two types of crimes: felonies and misdemeanors.* ***A felony is a crime punishable by imprisonment in a state prison, generally for a term of more than one year.*** *All other crimes are misdemeanors. Some misdemeanors are also punishable by imprisonment, but sentences for misdemeanors are served in a county jail, rather than a state prison, for a term of one year or less.* ***Most felonies are punishable by a fine as well as imprisonment.***
>
> *With only a handful of exceptions, Wisconsin has organized its felonies into a uniform penalty scheme, which is set forth in Wis. Stat. § 939.50 (3). Each felony is assigned to one of nine classes, and that assignment determines the penalties that apply. For each class, a maximum term of imprisonment is specified, and for seven of the classes, a maximum fine is also specified."*

Per state statutes - the max sentence allowed for each felony class is shown below.
(Table derived from cited sources.)

Felony Class	Maximum Imprisonment Term	Maximum Extended Supervision Term	Maximum Total Sentence	Maximum Fine
A	Life	n/a	Life	
B	40 years	20 years	60 years	
C	25 years	15 years	40 years	$100,000
D	15 years	10 years	25 years	$100,000
E	10 years	5 years	15 years	$50,000
F	7.5 years	5 years	12.5 years	$25,000
G	5 years	5 years	10 years	$25,000
H	3 years	3 years	6 years	$10,000
I	18 months	2 years	3.5 years	$10,000

https://www.stangllaw.com/blog/wisconsin-felony-classes-a-quick-guide
https://legis.wisconsin.gov/lrb/media/z5dh4yv1/statutory-felonies-94.pdf

Felony offenses and their classes related to Fleeing and Recklessly Endangering Safety tracked by Court Watch are:

- Statute 346.04(3) - Vehicle Operator Flee/Elude Officer (FEO) Felony **E-I** (low end upgraded in March 2024)
- Statute 941.30(1) - First Degree Recklessly Endangering Safety (RES1) Felony F
- Statute 941.30(2) - 2nd-Degree Recklessly Endangering Safety (RES2) Felony G

Habitual Criminality Repeater is a type of modifier to a charge which can extend the sentence up to 4 years. This modifier is added when an offender has had multiple previous charges of the same nature, indicating recidivist behavior and ineffective previous penalties. Thirty eight (11%) of the 335 sentenced cases had the Habitual Criminality Repeater modifier on one or more charges; 5 of those cases were granted probation.

Dismissed but Read in for Sentencing — an explanation

Some charges are dismissed as part of plea negotiations but are “read in” for sentencing purposes. While these dismissed charges cannot be counted as “convictions” when referenced in future cases, judges may consider the underlying conduct when determining a sentence. It is unclear how, or to what extent, additional sentencing weight is attributed to these read-in charges, as judges do not specify or itemize any added time related to them.

Court Watch Observations Data & Analysis

Due to the unique nature and complexity of certain cases and our recording practices to date, our analysis of cases is broken down as follows:

Cases included in Judge leniency measures	***335***
(less) Cases granted probation	141
Cases used for sentence comparisons of prosecutor vs judge	***194***

Recorded cases for this report have been categorized for comparison purposes as follows:

- FLEE ONLY (FEO) - a charge of 346.04 - Flee/Elude an officer but no RES1/2 - 58 cases
- FLEE/RES - charges of flee/elude and 1st or 2nd degree Reckless Endangering Safety - 53 cases
- FLEE/RES/OTHER Flee/elude and RES1/2 and/or Other charges (guns, drugs, auto theft/carjacking, armed robbery, bail jumping and others) - 224 cases

Three unique cases had multiple charges of fleeing (on different dates) or RES1 - for multiple victims.

Dismissed but Read-in for Sentencing

In this reporting period there were 144 charges across 141 cases that were dismissed but read-in as part of a plea bargain. (4 cases had more than one charge dismissed). The table below shows the charges that were dismissed but read-in for sentencing purposes by category.

Category	Total # cases	DR charges	FEO	RES1	RES2
Flee Only	58	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Flee/RES	53	34	50.9% (27)	0	13.2% (7)
Flee/RES/Other	224	110	34.8% (78)	3.6% (8)	10.7% (24)
Total	335	144	31% (105)	2.4% (8)	9.3% (31)

The District Attorney's office should stop dismissing fleeing and RES charges as part of plea negotiations with defendants in order to send a message that fleeing and Recklessly Endangering Safety is unacceptable and consequences for it are *non-negotiable.*

Median Sentence Recommendations (In Months) Prosecutor vs Judge

The data below reflect comparisons between the *median* sentences recommended by the prosecutor (DA) vs the *median* sentences granted by the judge for Flee/Elude, RES1, and RES2 cases followed by a subset for repeat felons.

Flee Only

For the 58 Flee Only cases, 40 were granted probation by the judge. Given the varying felony classes for fleeing (class E-I) there aren't enough cases to evaluate by each felony class. In general, the prosecutor's median recommendation was slightly higher or the same as the judge's median sentence, both being about 50% what is allowable in the statutory maximum sentence. Detailed data for this category can be found in the Appendix.

FLEE/RES - ALL cases (in months)

For the 53 cases having charges of First or Second Degree Reckless Endangering Safety (RES1/RES2), the prosecutor and judge median sentences are the same; however, both are less than half of the allowed statutory max for RES1 (90 months) or RES2 (60 months). Given that **every case having a RES1 or RES2 charge also includes a fleeing charge having its own statutory max value**, the median sentences for both the prosecutor recommendation and the judge are 20-25% of the total allowable statutory Max plus FEO.

Flee/RES category	# of cases 53	# cases given probation (by judge)	# cases without probation	Prosecutor Recommended incarceration time (months)	Judge Sentence time (months)	Statutory Max (months)	Statutory max plus FEO charge (months)
RES1 Felony F	4	2	2	36	33	90	126-150
RES2 Felony G	49	24	25	24	24	60	96-120

FEO/RES1 and FEO/RES2 for ALL cases (in months) - Repeat Felons subset

Of the 53 cases that had FEO, RES1/2 charges, 30 of them were committed by repeat felons. Even then, 7 cases were granted probation by a judge. For the remaining 23 cases, the prosecutor recommendation is higher than the judge's sentence, doubled for the single RES1 case, while both continue to be significantly less than the statutory max for either RES charge and significantly less (about 60% less) than the statutory max including FEO.

Flee/RES category	# of cases 30	# cases given probation (by judge)	# cases without probation	Prosecutor Recommended incarceration time (months)	Judge Sentence (months)	Statutory max (months)	Statutory max plus FEO charge (months)
RES1 Felony F	1	0	1	60	30	90	126-150
RES2 Felony G	29	7	22	33	24	60	96-120

Probation for Repeat Felons

Of 335 cases, 214 were committed by repeat felons of which *60 were granted probation* by the judge. The table below reflects the breakdown of these cases by category and whether the prosecutor recommended or the judge granted probation. A judge may order "condition time", up front detention at the House of Corrections often with HUBER privileges for work or child care, at the beginning of probation. (See table below).

Cases Involving Repeat Felons Where Prosecutors/Judge Recommended Probation

Category	# of cases (214)	# of cases Pros rec up to the court (UTC)	# cases Pros rec probation (w/condition time)	Judge granted Probation (w/condition time)
Flee Only	22	4	7 (4)	13 (10)
Flee/RES	30	4	1 (0)	7 (7)
Flee/RES/Other	162	7	8 (4)	40 (24)

ENE Recommendations

♥ Statutory Max

Over 18 months of observing reckless driving cases, collecting data, and analyzing sentencing trends, we have found that Milwaukee County judges *rarely impose the full sentences authorized by Wisconsin's Legislature* – the statutory maximum – for reckless driving-related offenses. In fact, we observed this in very few cases. This is both troubling and perplexing.

At a time when Milwaukee County and the City of Milwaukee are experiencing record – and rising – levels of reckless driving and fleeing incidents, and when citizens have clearly demanded stronger community protections, why are our elected judges not using their most potent deterrent – *the potential of a long prison sentence?* As imperfect as incarceration may be, it remains one of the most direct tools available to discourage future offenses. Judge Swanson, when ruling on a horrific vehicular homicide case committed by a 13 year old, was quoted as saying,

> "We under-invest in our youth, both in terms of education and in terms of corrections. Those systems are not where they should be, but they're the only systems the court can rely upon in my carrying out my duties and responsibilities."
> David Swanson
> Milwaukee County Circuit Judge - Milwaukee Journal Sentinel - 06/21/2025

To send an unequivocal message that reckless driving will no longer be tolerated, we propose that – for at least the next two years – prosecutors recommend and judges adopt the statutory maximum incarceration guideline as the *default starting point* for all flee/elude charges. While mitigating factors may, in rare cases, justify a modest reduction, even to a misdemeanor for young, first time offenders, most sentences should reach or approach the maximum - *especially* for those with prior criminal convictions AND prior fleeing offenses during this two-year "campaign."

Such an approach would create a powerful deterrent effect – something sorely missing under current practices – as word of the new sentencing standards spreads throughout the community. Let's try it and see if it works. **In the face of a widely acknowledged reckless driving crisis, the real question is: *Why wouldn't we take this step?***

♥ Reduce Dismissed Charges; NO "Up to the Court" recommendations;
The District Attorney's office should **stop dismissing fleeing and RES charges** as part of plea negotiations with defendants in order to send a message that fleeing and RES is unacceptable and consequences for it are *non-negotiable.*

Do not leave the sentence to the judge (up to the court). You have done all of the work - use the statutory guidelines to make a sentence recommendation in every case. The judge may overrule you - but he certainly will if you offer nothing for him to compare.

♥ Improve Court Efficiency
Reduce the rate of reschedules and time to close cases benefitting all parties - victims, defendants, attorney backlog.

♥ Focus on Community Protection: The ongoing safety of the community **must** remain central to sentencing decisions.

- **No probation** for repeat offenders
- **No probation** for new crimes committed while awaiting trial or on probation
- **Incarceration** (>1 year) for flee/elude and RES charges
- Incorporate **more consideration and consequence for victims and property damage** whether or not the victim is present in court to emphasize the economic and emotional impact on the community for the ongoing problem of fleeing and reckless driving and all crimes associated with it.
- More creative sentencing for first time offenders such as attending a vehicular homicide hearing, impact panel or targeted community service toward improving the reckless driving problem.

APPENDIX

Breakdown by Case Type

Cases selected must include a charge of flee/eluding an officer as one of the counts. Other relevant charges in the cases are tracked, especially 1st or 2nd degree reckless endangering safety (RES) along with the final disposition of the charge (guilty plea, guilty by jury, dismissed and read in or dismissed). The remaining charges (including charges for drugs, weapons, armed robbery, auto theft, bail jumping, resisting an officer) are accounted for in the total sentence.

	5/1/25-10/31/25		12/1/24-4/30/25		6/24/24-11/30/24	
Flee/Elude only	58	17%	28	16%	16	15%
Flee/Elude & Reckless Endangering Safety (RES)	53	16%	39	22%	28	26%
Flee/Elude, RES and other*	224	67%	103	59%	58	53%
Homicide**	N/A	N/A	4	3%	7	6%
Total	335		174		109	

*** includes charges for drugs, weapons, armed robbery, auto theft, bail jumping, resisting an officer, etc.**

****Homicide cases are now summarized in a separate section of the appendix**

Multiple Cases; Multiple Charges (FEO, RES1, RES2)

Of the 335 sentenced cases for the most recent time period:

- **231 cases (68%)** had additional charges beyond FEO/RES1/RES2 including drugs, weapons, armed robbery, auto theft, bail jumping, resisting an officer, etc.
- **83 cases (25%)** involved one or more additional cases for the same defendant resolved simultaneously. The additional cases are often committed while the defendant was out on bail.

Exclusion of Multi-Case Fleeing Defendants/Cases

This analysis excludes 42 cases involving 21 defendants with multiple fleeing charges, from the 335 total sentenced cases. These matters are typically adjudicated together and resolved through a single, global prosecutor recommendation and judge sentence. Including them as individual cases would either inflate recommendation figures or undercount fleeing charges; therefore, they were excluded to preserve analytical accuracy.

Of the 42 excluded cases, 8 resulted in probation (some with condition time), while the remaining 34 had a median judicial sentence of 36 months incarceration. This median is comparable to other felony fleeing cases and only slightly higher than cases involving RES charges, despite the frequent presence of additional charges such as firearms or drugs. This suggests that multiple fleeing incidents for the same defendant are not fully reflected in sentencing outcomes. These cases represent a significant aspect of the underlying problem—repeat fleeing behavior—but require a separate analytical category (e.g., “multi-case defendants”) to be accurately assessed.

Case Outcomes Data

	5/1/25-10/31/25	12/1/24-4/30/25	6/24/24-11/30/24
Cases monitored/attended	614	351	215
Cases sentenced (% of monitored)	335 (55%)	174 (50%)	109 (51%)
# of presiding Judges	17	16	14
# of Judges with 5 or more sentencing cases	12	9	8
More lenient sentences issued- all judges	55%	65%	69%
More lenient sentences issued - judges with > 5 cases	55%	68%	72%
Cases involving defendants with **previous convictions** of any kind (# of cases/%)	262 / 78%	137 / 79%	75 / 69%
Cases involving defendants with **previous felony convictions** (# of cases/%)	214 / 64%	101 / 58%	N/A
Cases **granted Probation** rather than incarceration (# of cases/%)	141 / 42%	85 / 49%	38 / 35%
Of those issued **probation**, *defendants* with **prior felonies.** (# of cases/%)	60 / 42%	33 / 39%	N/A
Cases include charges in addition to FEO & RES1/ RES2 (guns, drugs, other) (# of cases/%)	231 / 69%		
Fleeing case sentenced with *other cases* (# of cases/%)83/335	83 / 25%		

Sentencing Patterns (Leniency) by Individual Judge

Findings are ranked by most to least lenient for the current report period.

	5/1/25 - 10/31/25		12/1/24 - 4/30/25		6/24/24 - 11/30/24	
Judge	**total cases measured**	**% more lenient**	**total cases measured**	**% more lenient**	**total cases measured**	**% more lenient**
Kegel	14	93%	9	78%	7	57%
Ramos →	38	76%	16	75%	8	88%
Van Grunsven →	22	68%	12	92%	14	57%
Fragoso	48	63%	28	79%	7	29%
Shelton →	26	62%	30	57%	22	91%
Wall*	16	56%				
Davila	35	51%	27	59%	15	87%
Ashley	10	50%	5	60%		
Richards	58	45%	22	68%	14	50%
Sosnay*	9	44%				
Yang	28	39%	12	58%		
Kiefer*	21	19%				
Subtotal	**325**	**55%**	**161**	**68%**	**92**	**72%**
Judges with < 5 cases	10	50%	9	11%	10	40%
Grand Total	**335**	**55%**	**170**	**65%**	**102**	**69%**

*** Judge new in rotation, rotated to a new division or not enough cases to measure previously**
→ Judge rotated to another court/division in August, 2025

Three judges were rotated in/out at the beginning of August, 2025. Judges Shelton, Van Grunsven and Ramos were rotated to other courts; Judges Kiefer, Wall and Sosnay were rotated into the felony courts where we observe fleeing cases.

For judges with 5 or more cases they ruled equal to the DA on 36% (117) of the cases and tougher than the DA on 8.6% (28) of the cases.

Median sentence recommendations (in months) for FEO-only (each felony level) detail

The data below reflect comparisons between the median sentences recommended by the prosecutor vs granted by the judge for all cases in a category followed by a subset of cases for repeat felons.

For the 58 Flee Only cases, 40 were granted probation by the judge. In general, the prosecutor's median recommendation was slightly higher or the same as the judge's median sentence, both being about 50% of the allowable statutory maximum sentence. ***Note: the 1 felony class F (Operator Flee/Elude Officer-Great Harm) case which the Judge granted 36 months probation when 90 months of incarceration is the max - and see below that this was granted to a repeat felon.***

Flee Only (category)	# of cases (58)	# cases given probation (by judge)	Total cases without probation	Prosecutor Recommendation	Judge sentence	Statutory Max
Felony E	1	0	1	78.0	84.0	120
Felony F	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	90
Felony G	11	8	3	36	36	60
Felony H	36	24	12	24	18	36
Felony I	9	7	2	18	14.3	18

Median sentence recommendations (in months) for FEO-only (each felony level) - Repeat Felons

Flee Only (category)	# of cases (22)	# cases given probation (by judge)	Total cases without probation	Prosecutor recommendation	Judge sentence	Statutory Max
Felony E	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Felony F	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	90
Felony G	3	2	1	36	36	60
Felony H	11	5	6	30	24	36
Felony I	7	5	2	18	14.3	18

Homicide Cases

During this reporting period, 8 homicide cases were heard by Judges Havas, Wagner, Crivello and Swanson. Due to the limited number of cases per judge and the nature and complexity of the felony class and sentences, these case results are not included in the comparative data for the period. Homicide is the ultimate result we are trying to deter when addressing fleeing and reckless driving in a preventive rather than reactive manner. We remember every victim and their families who have needlessly suffered a loss of life, that, to quote Judge Swanson, "cannot be valued or quantified with a number" {of years in prison}.

The Victims

Robert C. Schmidt, 75, "A notorious jokester and roving comedian, Bob was well loved for his unique sense of humor and being the life of the party."

Sunita Balogun-Olayiwola, 47, Nigerian immigrant, caring and loving woman who "never let anything put her down".

Stanley Smith Jr., 41**,** shot while trying to save his car from being stolen; a son

Michael Captain, 31 passenger in a car driven recklessly before crashing into a bus. Another passenger was seriously hurt. Eight passengers on the bus were also injured.

Amir Alqaddi, riding his motorcycle with friends

SNG, 44-year-old woman, pronounced dead at the scene and ***SAC, 32 years old*** was taken to the hospital for treatment of serious injuries; 35th and Brown - crash when defendant ran a red light.

Jennifer Gail Dimatteo, 32*,* victim of hit-and-run while the defendant was out on bail for flee/elude.

Talise Dunmore, 20 years old - compassionate nail technician and ***De-Lisha Dunmore, 23*** years old future nurse and healthcare worker. De-Lisha initially survived the crash that killed her sister and was subsequently killed by gun violence.

Judicial Outcomes

One defendant was 13 years old at the time of his crime and referred to adult court due to the severity of the offense and charges, any previous juvenile activity is unknown. The remaining defendants all have previous convictions, 5 of them previous felonies; ages range 23-55 years old.

As the circumstances for each case varies, so do the sentences; range 24 months probation to an unlicensed driver to 43 years for a repeat OWI (5th) offender.

Case Inventory and Completion Rates

Open Fleeing Case Inventory:

- **June 2024:** Court Watch began with **800+ open fleeing cases**.
- **May 2025:** At the time of the last report there were **969 open cases**
- **October 2025:** At the end of October there were **990 open cases**.

This trend suggests either increased case filings or significant delays in case closures.

New Case Filings:

- **2024 average: 64 new fleeing cases per month**.
- **Through October 2025: 72 new cases per month**.

The increasing filing rate indicates that fleeing behavior—a subset of the broader reckless driving problem—remains persistent.

Cases initiated in 2023 that have been closed (sentenced or dismissed) took an **average of 16 months** to complete through the court system.

Victim Injury and Property Damage

Victim injury and property damage are frequently understated when cases are presented to the court. In many instances, victims are neither formally identified nor quantified unless they self-report or are documented as part of the incident scene in the criminal complaint. Restitution requests are uncommon and, when made, are typically limited to insurance deductibles or constrained by the court's assessment of the defendant's ability to pay. While victims may pursue civil remedies, doing so often imposes additional financial and emotional burdens for harms they did not invite.

During this reporting period, Court Watch began systematically tracking whether cases involved injury to individuals other than the defendant and/or damage to property belonging to others, including stolen vehicles. This information was derived from criminal complaints and court observations; as such, the figures should be considered conservative estimates.

Of the 335 cases reviewed:

- Property damage was reported in 174 cases (52%).
- Injury to one or more individuals was reported in 60 cases (18%).
- Both property damage and injury were reported in 53 cases (16%).

These figures underscore that innocent victims are present in a substantial majority of these offenses. Beyond physical injury and financial loss, victims and witnesses often experience lasting emotional and psychological impacts, including fear, trauma, and concern for their personal and family safety.

Mandatory Minimum Cases

Since the enactment of Senate Bill 514 on March 27, 2024, which established a mandatory minimum sentence for offenses resulting in great bodily harm or death, we have monitored 26 applicable cases. To date, 10 of these cases have reached sentencing, including four involving fatalities. All cases included additional charges of equal or greater felony classification. While a mandatory minimum sentence was imposed in each resolved case, its application was attributable to the severity of the accompanying charges—including those involving death—rather than the provisions of the new statute itself. Monitoring of these cases will continue, and findings will be shared with policymakers to inform their understanding of the law's practical impact and effectiveness.

Did you Know?

1. Did you know that most court proceedings are open to the public?
2. Did you know there is an online system for accessing public circuit court records?
3. Did you know that a felony court case may take a year or longer to get resolved? Numerous hearings may take place over the course of that year, including:
    - Arraignment
    - Status hearings
    - Bail hearings
    - Motion hearings
    - Pre-trial hearing
    - Trial itself
    - Plea hearing
    - Sentencing hearing
4. Did you know that the governor appoints judges to fill vacancies, but they must run for re-election? Most judges have a 6 year term and are **unopposed** for re-election.
5. Did you know judges have wide discretion in determining sentences for many types of crime? See Statutory Max explanation above.
6. Did you know there are 990 open fleeing/reckless driving cases in the Milwaukee County court system (as of October 31, 2025)?

Where are they now?

A review of defendants with cases sentenced June 2024 - November 2024 (1st reporting period) produced the following additional activity as reported in ccap through November 2025. The bulk of the 107 Flee/Elude and Reckless Driving Cases cases were assigned to judges Davila (15.31%), Richards (14.29%), Shelton (22.45%) and Van Grunsven (14.29%) .

- Overall 46.94% are still incarcerated.
- 8.16% HAVE RE-OFFENDED. Judges with the highest percentage of reoffenders:
  - Childs 20%,
  - Fragoso 14.29%,
  - Kegel 14.29%,
  - Richards 21.43%.
  - Shelton 4.55%.
- 38.78% defendants have NOT re-offended (at least not in Wisconsin per ccap). Judges'cases are:
  - Childs 60%,
  - Davilla 66.67%,
  - Fragoso 42.86%,
  - Richards 50%,
  - and Shelton at 50%.

We will continue this review on a periodic basis.

Jail vs House of Corrections(HOC) vs prison

Our case data includes references to "where" a defendant spends time prior to or post conviction including:

Jail - Milwaukee County uses jail as a holding place for defendants who have been arrested and charged, and cannot post bail.

House of Corrections (HOC) a.k.a Community Reintegration Center (CRC) - houses

· defendants who have not concluded their case(s), have not posted bail/bond (overflow from CJF/jail)

· defendants who have been sentenced to up to 12 months incarceration

· defendants sentenced to probation beginning with condition time (up to 12 months)

Prison (State Correctional Facilities) hold ONLY defendants who have been convicted to a sentence of more than 12 months)

Probation/Extended Supervision - supervision by the Department of Corrections while the defendant resides in the community.

Closing

This report reflects Enough is Enough's ongoing commitment to reducing reckless driving and advocating for accountability within Milwaukee County's Justice System. Through monitoring, data collection, and public awareness, the Court Watch Program aims to bring meaningful change to the judicial process resulting in safer streets and communities for ALL.

About US

Enough is Enough ~ A Legacy for Erin is a 501(c)(3) founded by the family and friends of Erin Mogensen, who, along with her unborn child, was tragically killed on November 2, 2023, by a serial felon fleeing police. Our mission is to eliminate reckless driving that results in injury and loss of innocent life throughout the State of Wisconsin.

Join us! - use this link to sign up and get involved

Our other touchpoints:

ene4erin.org ene4erin@gmail.com Facebook page Facebook group