1	STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT TAYLOR COUNTY
2	
3	STATE OF WISCONSIN, SENTENCING
4	Plaintiff,
5	VS. CASE NO: 00-CF-24
6	ROBERT PETERSON, 00-CM-02
7	Defendant.
8	
9	HONORABLE GARY L. CARLSON, JUDGE PRESIDING
10	
11	APPEARANCES:
12	MARA JOHNSTON, District Attorney, appeared on behalf of the
13	State of Wisconsin;
14	WRIGHT LAUFENBERG, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of
15	the Defendant, Robert Peterson.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	August 25, 2000
25	Lisa M. Weber, RPR COPY
	WOOLI KIK

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: State of Wisconsin, plaintiff, vs. Robert L. Peterson, 00-CF-24, 00-CM-2. Appearing is Mara Johnston, district attorney. Also appearing is Mr. Peterson with his attorney, Mr. Wright Laufenberg.

MR. LAUFENBERG: Judge, this was the time and place set, the 10:30 time today was set for plea and sentencing for Robert Peterson. As the Court may recall, we were in court about two weeks ago on this matter all set for plea and sentencing. The plea form was done when the victim raised her eye or something of that nature and the entire agreement was therefore modified based upon the request of the victim.

Mr. Peterson and I were amenable to that and trying to be as reasonable as possible and agree to that. It was set for today's date for a final

The 9:30 hearing today was set for motions. My client was here. Obviously he just showed up in the courtroom on that one. We are ready to proceed on that. However, the State made a request to reset that motion hearing due to the fact that their officers were unavailable.

hearing based upon the request of the victim.

We said we had no objection due to those reasons. We thought that was reasonable for they were in some other place for a court hearing. We agreed to that and that matter was to be reset.

Based upon that, judge, I said, well, I have to get down for a Fond du Lac hearing and I have to leave right away, let's move

Mr. Peterson to a 9:30 plea and sentencing. That was all agreed upon and ready to go except the victims could not be notified in a timely manner. Therefore, we cannot proceed at this time. I am making a request that we reset this plea and sentencing based upon those reasons.

MS. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, I have to object to that. The victims have been notified for numerous hearings in those cases. They have been frustrated every time we've come into court about it being rescheduled. There will be here at 10:30; and if this proceeding is not going, they will be definitely upset, and I'm very hesitant to agree to have this scheduled for yet another hearing. The state is ready to go. The victims are here in the felony matter but not in the misdemeanor matter and both cases are scheduled for 10:30.

1 THE COURT: You have to be where by 2 when? 3 MR. LAUFENBERG: I have to be down to Fond du Lac County about 1:00 this afternoon, which is about three hours away. I understand the State's position. We agree to their 7 obligation to the victim. We are back here because of their request and the victim's 8 request, so it is not us, judge. They made this 9 10 last request to adjourn it. We said, sure, 11 whatever we can do to be nice people and help you out; and now we said, let's do it at 9:30. 12 13 was fine. It is just a time crunch issue. I know the State can't agreed because they have the 14 15 victims. I think in fairness and equity and 16 because Mr. Peterson has been here and ready to do it last week and a time crunch, I am asking 17 18 that it be reset. 19 THE COURT: Can you tell me what you have in Fond du Lac County at 1:00? 20 21 MR. LAUFENBERG: I have a sentencing. 22 I have to go down and review the file. I have to 23 review a sentencing after revocation for 24 Mr. Allen. 25 THE COURT: Same Mr. Allen we have in

1	Taylor County?
2	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: What judge is in Fond du
4	Lac County that you are dealing with?
5	MR. LAUFENBERG: I think it is Judge
6	Weinke.
7	THE COURT: Can you tell me when that
8	proceeding got scheduled vis-a-vis the scheduling
9	of the hearing today. Was that done first?
10	MR. LAUFENBERG: That hearing was
11	actually set for 10:00 this morning; and after
12	about 60 calls probably and letters trying to
13	move that hearing, they agreed to move it until
14	2:00 this afternoon so I could be down there for
15	Mr. Allen.
16	THE COURT: What kind of hearing is it
17	for Mr. Allen?
18	MR. LAUFENBERG: Sentencing after
19	revocation, judge.
20	THE COURT: Can you tell me whether or
21	not they schedule down there in the sense that
22	everything is set at 1:00 and you might get in at
23	4:00 or do you think it is an hour certain?
24	MR. LAUFENBERG: That is an absolute
25	hour certain, judge.

1 THE COURT: When they scheduled this, 2 were they aware that you had obligations here at 3 10:30? 4 MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, they were, sir. 5 THE COURT: And they scheduled it anyway? 7 MR. LAUFENBERG: It was my request to 8 schedule it. I thought I could get down there, 9 judge. I was a mistake. I didn't know how long it took to get down there. 10 11 THE COURT: Two and three quarter 12 hours to the Appleton area. So Fond du Lac is 13 another 20 miles down the road. 14 MR. LAUFENBERG: I had to move the sun 15 and earth to get it set at two for the last two 16 weeks. 17 THE COURT: You are going to need a 18 transporter to get there by 1:00 as it is. I'm sorry I do not know your names but I have been 19 told you are the victims in the felony case. Can 20 21 I have your names? 22 MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: Rakovek's. 23 THE COURT: Okay. You've come in in the middle of this and you may not understand 24 25 what has happened. Mr. Laufenberg has an

obligation in another court in Fond du Lac at 1:00. He is asking if we can reset
Mr. Peterson's sentencing so he can get to Fond du Lac in that case.

MR. LAUFENBERG: Judge, the hearing is at 2:00. I need to be down there to meet with the DA. I don't want to mislead the court.

THE COURT: I understand. This would be an inconvenience to you. It is an inconvenience to him. It is an inconvenience to his client in Fond du Lac. No matter how it works out, somebody is going to be inconvenienced. Ms. Johnston is objecting. Do you have any comment as to whether or not I should allow Mr. Laufenberg to go to Fond du Lac and do that hearing in that other case. I'm not going to put the burden on you. I want to know if you have any comment. I will make the decision.

MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: I think this has gone on plenty long, and I think he knowingly said that they were both set up for today, and I think he should have timed it better. We have come several times.

MR. LAUFENBERG: We were set up,

ma'am. You changed the last time.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't think he should be arguing with the victim.

THE COURT: I don't know if it is who changed the deal but the deal did not work.

You've indicated you agreed to the new deal ramifications and you wanted it scheduled for today. Fond du Lac County scheduled you in any event, and apparently it was because you misunderstood the length of time it will take you to get from here to there. This is a no win situation because there is no way anybody is going to be happy here today.

If I require Mr. Laufenberg to remain,
I'm going to have -- he is going to have problems
with Judge Weinke down in Fond du Lac County. I
believe the thing in Fond du Lac involves a
gentleman from here who also has things pending
here if I remember right, which may or may not be
dependent on what happens in Fond du Lac County.
I suppose I could call Judge Weinke and ask him
if he might possibly move it, his hearing back an
hour or so so we could do this.

MR. LAUFENBERG: I don't think you will get through, judge. They don't answer their

phone.

THE COURT: We will try. We will go off the record.

MR. LAUFENBERG: I could get on the road, and I could appear by phone with Mr. Peterson.

THE COURT: Do you have any objection to that? Your attorney appearing by conference telephone as he is driving to Fond du Lac as opposed to him sitting here with you right now. It is up to you.

MR. LAUFENBERG: He would rather have me sitting here, judge.

THE COURT: We will go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. LAUFENBERG: Judge, we were here and set to go. It was the victim's and the state's request, that is the whole point of the story judge. Now, we are spending 15 minutes, we could have been done with the sentencing by then. We were here and ready to go. It was the victim's input that changed and modified the whole thing. We are asking for a different hearing and finalize this matter.

MS. JOHNSTON: Blaming the victim

isn't getting you anywhere, Wright. 2 MR. LAUFENBERG: The whole thing is 3 modified because of that. THE COURT: It doesn't help to blame the victims. The victims have a right to have input if they don't like the way things are going They have a right to make the statement. If the two of you change the agreement because of 8 that, I wouldn't blame the victims for that. 9 10 MR. LAUFENBERG: It is ridiculous that 11 the inherent flexibility of Mr. Peterson to be here and modify and change is not then rewarded 12 in this case when his counsel has to be somewhere 13 14 else. That is inherently unfair. 15 THE COURT: I am tending to agree with 16 you Mr. Laufenberg, so don't blow it. I would like to hear from Judge Weinke if I can. 17 all but then that probably screws up a district 18 19 attorney and victims over there. 20 (Discussion off the record.) 21 THE COURT: The record should reflect that Judge Weinke has joined us on the conference 22 speaker phone. Judge, I've explained the 23 24 situation to you about Mr. Laufenberg's problems 25 and the timing for our hearing and your hearing.

1	JUDGE WEINKE: Yes, that's correct.
2	THE COURT: You'd indicated on the
3	phone that you might be able to move his hearing
4	back a bit so we could do ours here.
5	JUDGE WEINKE: That would also be
6	correct. If that helps Mr. Laufenberg.
7	THE COURT: Would that help you,
8	Mr. Laufenberg?
9	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, it would, judge.
10	THE COURT: If we conduct our hearing
11	here and we are done by quarter to 11, how much
12	time do you need to get to Fond du Lac and talk
13	to your client then, at least three hours to get
14	there?
15	MR. LAUFENBERG: I have no idea. I
16	have never traveled from here to Fond du Lac.
17	THE COURT: I would imagine if you can
18	get to Fond du Lac by 2:00 to 2:15, you can talk
19	to your client. Judge, would you be able to
20	conduct his hearing sometime after 3:00?
21	JUDGE WEINKE: I think so. That would
22	be fine, judge.
23	THE COURT: Thank you very much,
24	judge. I appreciate your consideration.
25	JUDGE WEINKE: Very good. Thank you,

Judge Carlson. 1 MR. LAUFENBERG: Judge Weinke, will 3 you be advising the district attorney's office of that? JUDGE WEINKE: I will take care of that for you. MR. LAUFENBERG: Thank you, sir. 7 8 THE COURT: We will recess until the victims are here, but we will start at 10:30 10 whether they are here or not. 11 (A recess was taken.) 12 THE COURT: State of Wisconsin 13 plaintiff, vs. Robert L Peterson. Case number 14 00-CF-24 and 00-CM-2. Appearing in this matter is Mara Johnston, district attorney. 15 16 Mr. Peterson is here personally with his attorney, Mr. Wright Laufenberg. Also present is 17 Sara Olson by conference telephone. I believe 18 she is a victim in one of the cases. There are 19 also present in court the Rakovek's 20 R-A-K-O-V-E-K. 21 MS. JOHNSTON: The juvenile and her 22 mother. 23 THE COURT: They are the victims in 24 the felony case. This is the date and time set 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by the Court for plea and disposition I believe in this case. Mr. Laufenberg, Ms. Johnston.

MS. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, as you noted, the victims have been notified and are present and available in court. I believe that each and every one of them would like to make a statement prior to the Court making the final decision.

The agreement that we have reached is as follows: As to case number 00-CM-02, the defendant has agreed to plead no contest to the charge of theft. Our agreed sentencing recommendation is to impose and stay 90 days county jail, a \$200 fine plus costs and restitution. He would be placed on probation for a period of two years with the following conditions: Restitution, \$50 fine plus costs, ten days county jail with work release privileges. Additionally, he would pay restitution in case number 00-CF-24, have no contact with Jerilyn Rakovek R-A-K-O-V-E-K and attend and successfully complete sex offender treatment with Bob Fox as recommended by the probation agent.

As to 00-CF-24, the defendant would

plead guilty to count one, sexual assault of a child. The State would move to dismiss but read in the remaining charges. After his guilty plea but before the Court finds him guilty, the State moves for a deferred prosecution agreement on this felony charge. He will pay no fine but court costs on the charge as an additional condition of his probation in case number 00-CM-2.

If he successfully completes his probation in case 00-CM-2 at the end of the two-year period, the State will move to amend the felony charge to a misdemeanor offense of sexual contact with a person who is 16 but not yet 18. If he does not comply with his probation in that other case, the State would move to revoke the deferred prosecution agreement and he would face sentencing upon his guilty plea. The deferred prosecution agreement has been prepared as an order for Your Honor's signature and has been reviewed already by the defense.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Laufenberg, is that your client's and your understanding of the agreement here?

MR. LAUFENBERG: Judge, that is our

1	understanding of the proposal. With regard to
2	the restitution in 00-CF-24, Mr. Peterson would,
3	of course, and I will explain that to him in
4	great detail, have the right to request a
5	restitution hearing for any and all restitution
6	that may be claimed.
7	THE COURT: A hearing on it?
8	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir.
9	THE COURT: Do you have a plea
10	questionnaire form?
11	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, I do, judge.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Peterson, do you
13	understand the agreement your attorney and the
14	district attorney put on the record?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: Is that what you are
17	intending to do today?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: Then in 00-CM-2 charging
20	you with theft, what is your plea?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
22	THE COURT: In 00-CF-24, to count one
23	second degree sexual assault of a child, what is
24	your plea?
25	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Now, you and your lawyer 1 2 did this plea questionnaire form. It seems to 3 have been completely filled out. Is this your signature, Robert, on page two? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: When you signed this, had you read it? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Did you understand what 10 you were reading? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 12 THE COURT: When you completed the 13 document by filling in the blanks and checking the boxes and signing the document, did you do so 14 in a truthful and honest manner? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Can I rely, Robert, on the representations you are making to me in this 18 document? 19 THE DEFENDANT: You bet. 20 21 THE COURT: When a person enters a plea of guilty to criminal charges, there are 22 rights they are giving up. They are listed on 23 the front of the form. Those rights include your 24 right to have a trial in this case, your right to 25

remain silent and not give any evidence against yourself, your right to testify yourself and present evidence at that trial. In fact, the right to have subpoenas or court orders issued directing people to come to court to give testimony on your behalf. You have a right at a trial to have 12 jurors chosen from the community who can be fair and impartial and listen to the evidence and they would decide if you are guilty or not guilty. They would also have to make that decision unanimously, all of them would have to agree.

You have a right to confront here in court while under oath the witnesses against you and to question or cross-examine them; and finally, you have the right to make the State prove that you are guilty of these offenses by the burden of proof of beyond a reasonable doubt. If you enter the plea today, you are giving up those constitutional rights. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and are you, in fact, giving them up of your own free will?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Are any of these rights 2 3 something that you have any question about or you would like me to explain further to you? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. THE COURT: Your lawyer has also 7 attached to the document another page called elements of common criminal offenses, and he has 9 checked the box for theft, which is the charge in 10 00-CM-2 to which you are pleading. This sets out the elements, that is, what it is the State would 11 12 have to prove in order to find you guilty. Do 13 you understand those elements? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Would you like me to 16 explain them in greater detail to you this 17 morning? 18 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 19 THE COURT: He has also listed on the 20 front of the form the elements of the offense of second degree sexual assault. That is that you 21 had sexual intercourse with an individual who was 22 23 not over the age of 16 at that time. Do you 24 understand that? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Do you have any question
2	about what I mean by the term sexual intercourse?
3	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
4	THE COURT: Do you have any question
5	about what I mean that the person was not of a
6	legal age, 16 or over? Do you understand that?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
8	THE COURT: Do you have any question
9	at all, sir, about what it is you are pleading
10	guilty to here this morning?
11	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
12	THE COURT: Are you entering these
13	pleas of your own free will?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: Are you satisfied you
16	understand and know what you what it is you
17	are doing here today?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: Now, do you understand
20	that even though counsel and you have reached an
21	agreement, those are recommendations and judges
22	are not required to impose what a recommendation
23	is. Do you understand that?
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
25	THE COURT: In fact, the judge could

impose up to the maximum penalty in a case if the 1 judge chose to do that. Do you understand that? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I believe for the record, 5 the charge of theft is a class A misdemeanor 6 punishable by a fine of \$10,000 and nine months 7 in the county jail, and the charge of second degree sexual assault of a child is a class B/C 9 felony punishable by a fine of \$10,000 and up to 20 years in the Wisconsin State Prison System. 10 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: And further, on the 14 felony, this is something that is alleged to have 15 occurred after December 31 of 1999, I believe. 16 MS. JOHNSTON: No, Your Honor, it is 17 not. 18 THE COURT: Okay so it is not. 19 Mr. Peterson, knowing the rights you are giving 20 up, do you still wish to plead guilty to these two counts? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Laufenberg, have you 23 had a sufficient opportunity to thoroughly 24 discuss this case and the plea decision with your 25

1	client?
2	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Are you satisfied he is
4	entering the pleas this morning freely,
5	voluntarily and intelligently?
6	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: Are you satisfied that
8	Mr. Peterson understands the nature of the
9	charge, including the elements of the offense and
10	the effects of the plea?
11	MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: Robert, have you had
13	enough of an opportunity to thoroughly discuss
14	this case and the plea decision with your
15	attorney?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: Are you satisfied by the
18	assistance Mr. Laufenberg has provided to you?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
20	THE COURT: Then I do direct that the
21	clerk enter the pleas in the record and ask the
22	State for the facts she has to support the
23	charge.
24	MS. JOHNSTON: The State relies on
25	each of the criminal complaints.

MR. LAUF

THE COURT: Any objection to that?

MR. LAUFENBERG: No, sir.

THE COURT: The Court finds that the defendant understands these proceedings and that his plea is a free, voluntary and intelligent one. I'm satisfied that Mr. Peterson does understand the constitutional rights that are waived by the plea and that he is waiving these rights freely and voluntarily. I'm satisfied a factual basis exists for these pleas based on the record, that he has committed the crimes charged to which he is entering a plea.

On the misdemeanor, the Court accepts the plea and I find the defendant guilty. Upon that finding of guilty, it is adjudged that the defendant is convicted of the crime of misdemeanor theft in violation of section 943.20(1)(a). With respect to the felony charge, the request is for a deferred prosecution agreement, so I will not enter a finding of guilt at this time. With respect to sentencing then, does the district attorney have a comment she wants to make?

MS. JOHNSTON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the defense have a

1 comment it wants to make, Mr. Laufenberg? 2 MR. LAUFENBERG: I would like to reserve my comments until after I hear the 3 victim's speech. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Peterson, anything you 6 want to say or any reason why the Court should not impose sentence against you? 7 8 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Olson, do you wish to 10 make any statement before the Court sentences 11 Mr. Peterson on the misdemeanor theft? 12 MS. OLSON: Yeah, I would just like 13 Robert to think next time before he does 14 something. It has put me through a lot of stress and anxiety over the whole situation. I think he 15 should think next time before he does something 16 17 that is against the law. Robert is a full grown man and he should know right from wrong. That is 18 19 all I have to say. 20 THE COURT: Thank you very much, 21 Ms. Olson. Is it Jerilyn? 22 MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: Gerald is my 23 husband. 24 THE COURT: Your name? 25 MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: Teresa.

THE COURT: Any comments you want to make before the Court imposes sentence? That's fine you may do so. You can stay back there. I would only ask that you speak loud enough so the court reporter can hear you.

MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: As you can see by now, first of all, Jerilyn is expecting. Things need to be understood. When you look at statistics about what happens to young girls when things like this happen to them, I think Robert should be held accountable. He thought -- Robert came into our home and acted like a nice guy. He walked down to the grandparents. He acted like he was just a nice person until you got to know the real Robert. It's not the same person that he is trying to portray himself as he is here as far as I'm concerned.

He told Jerilyn he cared about her.

Meanwhile, he got her on drugs, he raped her, he intimidated her, he scared her, he stalked her.

He told her that if he ever -- if she ever got another boyfriend, that he would kill both of them is what he had told her. She told me this, I mean, at the time when she knew him before I knew the situation here and made this girl scared

-

•

to death. She, first of all, would not talk to the detective when he came out because she was so intimidated. She said, mom, he will do something. He will hurt us, and I had to tell her and convince her that we could fight this. It was ridiculous.

Jerilyn said that he had shown her a list of 20 to 30 girls that he had had sex with by the age of 17 and a half. Personally, I think Robert has some mental problems and needs some big time counseling to deal with his problems.

Next, I don't think that the ten days in jail under the Huber law is enough. I think he should get more out of it. I think what he did to this gal is terrible, and I think it is a problem in today's society that people get away with it.

I would like to thank Mara for proceeding with this case because I think way too often this kind of stuff gets left and people just deal with the mess, so I very much thank her for taking it on; and I thank Patty for everything she has done because we have never dealt with the court system before, never in our family life and its been tough. We've never needed them before, so I thank both of them for

everything they did.

As far as Mr. Laufenberg in trying to blame Jerilyn the first time we were here, I would like to ask him how he sleeps at night because I think he was totally, totally wrong and he can say and do what he wants, but I know what happened and to try to sit there and blame the kid that is 15 against this boy that is 17 and a half is absolutely ridiculous, just ridiculous. I think he also should have to write a letter of apology to Jerilyn and write a letter of apology to us, and I really, really think he needs some ordered counseling.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Jerilyn, anything you want to say?

MS. JERILYN RAKOVEK: I will let Patty talk for me.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Krueger.

MS. KRUEGER: Jerilyn has asked me to relay to the Court the frustration and hurt the criminal justice process has caused her, not only the crime in and of itself that was difficult, having had to sit through these hearings and being attacked by Robert through his attorney has been like being assaulted again. At one hearing

the defense attorney claimed that Robert was the victim. Earlier today I was being pressured to proceed to this hearing before it was scheduled. Everything about this process has been focused on Robert and not me.

I want a letter of apology not only to me but to my family as well. Robert's actions nearly destroyed my relationship with my entire family. I don't think that ten days in the county jail is enough for what he has done to me. His actions today are further proof of it. As my mom was reading, I watched him smirk, and I wonder if he will ever understand.

THE COURT: Thank you. Jerilyn, is that basically what you wanted me to know?

MS. JERILYN RAKOVEK: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Laufenberg, you withheld comment until after you heard from the victims. We have now heard from them. Any argument you want to make about disposition here?

MR. LAUFENBERG: Yes, sir, I have absolutely no problem sleeping at night, ma'am.

MS. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, I don't think the defense attorney should be addressing the victims.

5366 13

MR. LAUFENBERG: I can address the victims any time I want. She is attacking my credibility

THE COURT: I want you to address your comments to me. It is Mr. Peterson that gets sentenced, not them.

MR. LAUFENBERG: You have a boy in front of you. He was 17 years old at the time. The girl was 15. Now, so the Court is aware of it, she is obviously pregnant right now and that is not Robert's baby, so she is otherwise pregnant and she is 16 years old. I know parents when they make mistakes in life and the children don't turn out as they will, they need to blame someone else. They need to deflect the blame, let's blame the criminal justice system, let's blame the 17-year-old boy, his attorney. The blame should lie where it starts with.

Judge, the discovery reports are that this child was suicidal previously and the cops showed up, and she said she was suicidal because she hates her mother and wants to die. That is directly from the police reports that the officer noted when they came to her house. And why does the defense attack the victim? I am not

2

4

5

6

_

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

attacking the victim. I'm stating the uncontroverted facts from the friend of Jerilyn.

There is one -- one of the incidents is involving this car and there is four people in the car. Robert is in the back seat with Jerilyn. She proceeds to give him oral sex. There is the people in the front seat. This is a girlfriend of hers and another gentleman and the person in the front seat does the same thing. They speak to the people in the front seat. They speak to the girl and she says -- her name is Tiffany. Tiffany indicated that her recollection of the incident was that Jerilyn and herself were in a vehicle with two male individuals. indicated Jerilyn made the statement to her whether or not they were going to give the two boys blow jobs for giving them a ride in their vehicle.

Tiffany stated at this point she felt she was going to perform this act due to the fact that Jerilyn was also going to do it. Tiffany stated that the reason she had oral sex with the person in the front was that Jerilyn can be somewhat manipulative and she has a way of convincing people with going along with what she

wants them to do or become involved.

She stated the reason she had was that Jerilyn was going to do that in the back seat. Jerilyn made the statement to her in the vehicle in relation to, if you do it with Darin and I will do it with Robert and that is why she did it. Now, is that attacking the victim? That is not attacking the victim. That is what her friend told the police when they came to the story or when they came to ask her about that. Is that attacking someone? That is not attacking someone. Is the resolution we've reached here that he has plead to a felony and has a felony over his head, is that reasonable? That is terribly reasonable.

It is a 15-year-old and 17-year-old; and pursuant to her friend, she is the one that initiated this. Judge, we did file a motion to dismiss the complaint for selective prosecution. He was a boy. He was under the age of 18. A crime could have been charged against her for what she did. The Court decided -- the DA decided not to prosecute that. The Court decided not to countenance that motion. You have a young boy here. Girls mature faster than boys. I

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

guarantee the maturity of the child is more than the maturity level of Robert Peterson next to me, Judge.

The counseling from Bob Fox for sexual offender, which is not on point, he will do it and make sure he does a good job at it. He will continue with his job. He will continue to be a good person. He will continue to stay out of trouble, but is he some mad rapist lurking in the woods to assault people as they willey nilley come down the road, that is not the case here, Judge. I say to you that the deal that is reached is reasonable if not more stiff than necessary. There is not really given this factual pattern and given the initiative actions of the victim, there is no reason for more than what is being proposed to the Court. This is extremely reasonable; and if they say that is attacking a victim, reading the police report, the discovery from the district attorney's office from the cops talking to the people, if that's attacking a victim, well, I'm sorry then I am going to state the facts to the Court, and I would ask the Court to adopt this is more than reasonable. This is more than fair, and we

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certainly are going to reserve the right to challenge any restitution figure that comes out as a result of this.

THE COURT: Ms. Johnston, do you have any rebuttal?

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

THE COURT: As to the sentencing here today, the recommendation is that the Court, in fact, sentence Robert on the misdemeanor theft charge but defer the prosecution on the felony sexual assault charge. The theory is that if Robert can follow through on the deferred prosecution agreement on the probation, make the restitution, do the counseling and basically prove that he is capable of conforming his conduct with the law, then the Court, pursuant to the deferred prosecution agreement, would enter a sentence on a misdemeanor charge. If he doesn't and he messes it up, the deferred prosecution agreement would be revoked and he would be back in here and he would then be sentenced on the felony sexual assault.

So I want to make the victims clear that if I go along with this agreement, the sentence that is actually being imposed today is

on the theft and I'm holding open what I am going to do on the felony sexual assault charge to see if Robert can toe the line. And if he can't, then he is going to be back in front of me and he has a 20-year maximum sentence facing him. I think it is 20 years. If he can toe the line, if in fact he is the boy that Mr. Laufenberg claims he is, then the Court would sentence on a lesser charge.

Now, I've heard Jerilyn and her mother indicate that they don't believe ten days in the county jail is enough, and it is not enough on a sexual assault charge. I absolutely agree with you. It is enough in this case on the theft charge. So I want you to understand if I go along with this, that I agree with you that ten days would not be enough for what Robert did to Jerilyn. And if it comes time to tell him that, I can take that into consideration. But I think it is important that you understand what I have to deal with today and I realize the Rakovek's, as she said, have not been in court before. They don't understand the system.

I want you to understand this part of the system. There is two cases here,

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

misdemeanor, felony sexual assault. But what I'm really sentencing today is on the misdemeanor. I'm holding that sexual assault over Robert's head; and if it comes time that he proves he can't follow through, as I think the Rakovek's are saying -- I don't think they have a lot of faith in Robert -- he will be back in front of me and he will find out what I think a second degree sexual assault is worth.

The plan that the attorneys have put before me, in my opinion, gives me the opportunity to sort of have my cake and eat it Because on the misdemeanor, I can sentence too. I can put him on probation. I can make him pay restitution and make him do all of the counseling that everybody thinks Robert needs; and I can hold a sword over his head and say, Robert, you are on an incredibly short leash. You jerk that leash even once, it's probably going to be taken away and you are going to be sitting in jail and probably prison for a long time, so that's what I mean by having the ability to have my cake and eat it too because I can do what I want to do; but I also have the opportunity to hold a very long period of

I

incarceration over Robert's head to make sure he does what I want him to do.

explain this because I wanted Jerilyn and her mother to understand that I agree with them.

What happened is not worth ten days. It just isn't. Two of Mr. Laufenberg's arguments that Jerilyn may have initiated this, the bottom line is that it doesn't make one bit of difference and it doesn't make one bit of difference because of her age and his age. Yes, under the law as it exists now, he was under the age of 18.

Therefore, he too is a person who cannot have sexual contact or intercourse.

However, under the criminal law, he is 17; and as a 17-year-old, he is deemed to understand that he has responsibilities and those responsibilities are those of an adult; and those responsibilities are as an adult, not to either take advantage of juveniles, that's it, not to take advantage. He is supposed to know better. Does he know better? Maybe he is the immature gentleman that Mr. Laufenberg says he is. Maybe he is a boy. Maybe he needs to grow up, but under the law when you reach that 17th threshold,

that year of your life, you are deemed to know the law and deemed to accept the responsibilities not to break it and not to break it by taking advantage of a young girl, not to break it by taking advantage of the people who help you out and do things for you, not to steal from people.

As Ms. Olson says, you are an adult. You know better. You knew what you were doing was wrong but you did it any way. That is what the problem is. Because this agreement gives me the opportunity to have it both ways here, I will agree to it. I would probably not have agreed to the deferred prosecution agreement alone, but because of the misdemeanor which allows me to use the offices of the Department of Corrections Probation and Parole to engage in additional monitoring and the ability to order additional factors, including restitution and counseling, I will go along with the agreement.

I will tell you now, Robert, you are on a short leash. You do mess it up, you're in serious trouble. This is a huge thing for a person of your age to be possibly facing in terms of prison time and you've got to trust me, Robert, no matter what your attorney said, even

if it is true, you still knew better. You can't do that.

When a judge imposes a sentence, I have to think about a lot of different things and one of the things I have to think about is how other people your age might respond similarly to these situations; and I have to make an example of you sometimes and say to you because of what you did, I want to do something to make sure others understand that they can't do that. When there are other Jerilyn's out there, I want 17 and a half year old boys to know they are facing an extremely serious penalty if they do that.

So I will approve and I impose as the sentence in the misdemeanor case that which was recommended by counsel. I will direct that the restitution be calculated and a report filed by probation and parole within 45 days; and if Mr. Peterson wishes to have a hearing on that, we will schedule it appropriately. I direct the clerk of court to prepare a judgment of conviction in accordance with this agreement.

There are fines and restitution that will have to be paid. I direct that the fine be paid within the first 90 days of the probation.

The restitution shall be paid on a schedule adopted by the Department of Corrections. On the felony charge, I'm going to approve the deferred prosecution agreement and order in this case, and I will at this time sign the same and order the parties to comply with it. I hope, Mr. Peterson, we do not have to come back again to this court for a sentencing on the felony. I don't want the Rakovek's, and I'm sure I'm messing your name up, I don't want to put them through this again, but I think you are now in a situation where it is your decision to make which way we go.

You know, people have crossroads in life. This is a major cross road for you. You are going to make a decision to toe the line straight and narrow, not violate the law. Do what you've got to do and make decisions that are appropriate as an adult in which case this will be something that you will be able to get over and move on in your life and Jerilyn can move on in her life. Ms. Olson can move on in her life.

On the other hand, you make the wrong turn today, you will be committing a major mistake that is going to drastically change the rest of your life. You've gone through the plea

questionnaire and the appeal rights with your 1 client. I assume that has been resolved. Jail 2 will commence within 20 days at the discretion of 3 probation and parole. Jerilyn and Teresa, do you 5 have any comments? Ms. Olson? 6 MS. OLSON: No. 7 THE COURT: All right. Then at this time, we will be disconnecting and we are completed with the proceeding. 9 10 MS. TERESA RAKOVEK: You asked if I 11 had any other comments. Just a quick one here. Tiffany was not Jerilyn's friend. They make it 12 out that way. She was not. It was their friend. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very 14 Court's in recess. 15 much. 16 (The record was concluded at this point) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

T 9

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WISCONSIN)

COUNTY OF TAYLOR) ss.

I, Lisa M. Weber, official court reporter/notary public, do certify that the attached transcript is a true and accurate transcript of my stenotype notes transcribed by me and that the same is a true and correct record of the proceedings held on the 23th day of August, 2000.

DATED THIS 3RD DAY OF OCTOBER, 2000.

LISA M. WEBER, RPR