## SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

Case No.:	99-0554
Complete Title of Case:	State of Wisconsin, Plaintiff-Respondent, v. David M. Hahn, Defendant-Appellant.
	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 2000 WI 118 Reported at: 238 Wis. 2d 889, 618 N.W.2d 528
Opinion Filed: Submitted on Briefs: Oral Argument:	February 9, 2001
Source of APPEAL COURT: COUNTY: JUDGE:	
JUSTICES: Concurred: Dissented: Not Participating:	

ATTORNEYS:

## NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing and modification. The final version will appear in the bound volume of the official reports.

No. 99-0554-CR

STATE OF WISCONSIN

IN SUPREME COURT

State of Wisconsin,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

**FILED** 

v.

FEB 9, 2001

David M. Hahn,

Defendant-Appellant.

Cornelia G. Clark Clerk of Supreme Court Madison, WI

¶1 PER CURIAM. (on motion for reconsideration). The State of Wisconsin, plaintiff-respondent, moves the court to reconsider the following sentence in paragraph 28 of its opinion in <a href="State v. Hahn">State v. Hahn</a>, 2000 WI 118, 238 Wis. 2d 889, 618 N.W.2d 528:

"If the offender has no means available under state law or is unsuccessful in challenging the prior conviction, the offender may nevertheless seek to reopen the enhanced sentence." The State contends this sentence raises the question of what justification would exist for the defendant to seek to reopen the enhanced sentence if the defendant had unsuccessfully challenged the prior conviction.

 $\P 2$  To clarify the original  $\underline{Hahn}$  opinion, we now modify the sentence quoted above to read as follows:

If the offender has no means available under state law to challenge the prior conviction on the merits, because, for example, the courts never reached the merits of this challenge under <u>State v. Escalona-Naranjo</u>, 185 Wis. 2d 168, 517 N.W.2d 157 (1994), or the offender is no longer in custody on the prior conviction, the offender may nevertheless seek to reopen the enhanced sentence.

 $\P 3$  The motion for reconsideration is denied without costs.