



## USA v. Jackson

2017 | Cited 0 times | E.D. Wisconsin | January 25, 2017

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. Case No. 16-CR-185 ANTOINE L. JACKSON,  
Defendant.

### REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The United States of America and the defendant, Antoine L. Jackson, who was represented by counsel, appeared before me for a change of plea colloquy pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 on January 23, 2017. ECF No. 15. Mr. Jackson consented to my conducting the change of plea colloquy, and United States stood on the position of their office in regards to consent. I explained that it would be for the U.S. District Judge alone, not me, to enter the plea and that my role was to conduct the plea colloquy and then to prepare a report and recommendation for ultimate disposition by Judge Stadtmueller.

After Mr. Jackson was placed under oath and advised as to the implications of being untruthful, I questioned him about his competency to go forward with the hearing. Through his responses, I found that Mr. Jackson was lucid, intelligent, and not under the influence of any intoxicants or substances.

I then discussed in detail each of the subjects specified in Rule 11, including the rights he would surrender by entering a plea of guilty, the maximum penalties associated with the charged offense, and the authority of the sentencing judge to disregard any recommendations in the plea agreement and to sentence Mr. Jackson at the statutory maximums. It was my impression that Mr. Jackson fully understood the rights he was surrendering and the implications of pleading guilty. Mr. Jackson was also satisfied that he had received effective assistance of counsel.

At the conclusion of this colloquy, I determined that the guilty plea was knowing and voluntary and was not induced by threats or by promises not contained in the plea agreement. I found that there was an independent factual basis containing each of the essential elements of Counts 1 and 2 of the Indictment (ECF No. 1), to which Mr. Jackson was pleading guilty. Mr. Jackson advised that he was pleading guilty to the charged offenses because he was, in fact, guilty and that the government could prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty of the charged offenses. Finally, I found that, in responding to my questions, Mr. Jackson was candid, respectful, and non-evasive, fully accepting



## USA v. Jackson

2017 | Cited 0 times | E.D. Wisconsin | January 25, 2017

responsibility for and acknowledging the unlawfulness of his conduct.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that defendant Antoine L. Jackson plea of guilty be accepted; that a presentence investigation and report be prepared according to the schedule set by the Court; and that Mr. Jackson be adjudicated guilty and have sentence imposed accordingly.

Your attention is directed to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C), Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b), and E.D. Wis. Gen. L. R. 72(c), whereby written objections to any recommendation herein, or part thereof, may be filed within fourteen days of service of this Recommendation or prior to the Final Pretrial Conference, whichever is earlier. Objections are to be filed in accordance with the Eastern District of

the district court shall result in a waiver of your right to appeal. If no response or reply will be filed, please notify the Court in writing.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 25th day of January, 2017. BY THE COURT:

s/ David E. Jones

DAVID E. JONES United States Magistrate Judge

