

FILED
03-27-2026
Waupaca County Courts
Yvette Kienert
2026CF000111

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT WAUPACA COUNTY

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff,

CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

vs.

CASE TYPE: CF

ANDREW J SHOWERS
C/O CHRISTOPHER T VAN WAGNER
110 E MAIN ST, STE 705
MADISON, WI 53703
DOB: 01/20/1988
SEX/RACE: M/W
EYE COLOR: BLUE
HAIR COLOR: BLONDE
HEIGHT: 5 FT 9 IN
WEIGHT: 180 LBS

DA CASE #:
2026WP000362

AGENCY CASE #:
C25-05145

DA/ADA ASSIGNED:
KAT TURNER

JUDGE ASSIGNED:

Defendant.

The undersigned, being first duly sworn, states that:

Count 1: POSSESSION OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

The above-named defendant On or between August 16, 2025 and August 18, 2025, in the City of Clintonville, Waupaca County, Wisconsin, did, having attained the age of 18, knowingly access in any way with the intent to view photograph(s) of a child engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and reasonably should have known that the child was under the age of 18, contrary to sec. 948.12(1m)&(3)(a), 939.50(3)(d) Wis. Stats.

Upon conviction for this offense, a Class D Felony, the defendant may be fined not more than One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000), or imprisoned not more than twenty five (25) years, or both.

And furthermore, invoking the provisions of Wisconsin Statute 973.042(2), upon conviction for a crime under 948.05 or 948.12 and the defendant is at least 18 years of age at the time of the commission of the crime, the Court shall impose a surcharge of \$500.00 for each image or each copy of an image, as defined in 973.042(1), associated with the crime. The court shall determine the number of images or copies of images associated with the crime by a preponderance of the evidence and without a jury.

And furthermore, invoking the provisions of Wisconsin Statute Section 939.617, upon conviction the Court shall impose a bifurcated sentence including a term of initial confinement for at least three years.

Count 2: POSSESSION OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

The above-named defendant On or between August 16, 2025 and August 18, 2025, in the City of Clintonville, Waupaca County, Wisconsin, did, having attained the age of 18, knowingly access in any way with the intent to view photograph(s) of a child engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and reasonably should have known that the child was under the age of 18, contrary to sec. 948.12(1m)&(3)(a), 939.50(3)(d) Wis. Stats.

Upon conviction for this offense, a Class D Felony, the defendant may be fined not more than One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000), or imprisoned not more than twenty five (25) years, or both.

And furthermore, invoking the provisions of Wisconsin Statute 973.042(2), upon conviction for a crime under 948.05 or 948.12 and the defendant is at least 18 years of age at the time of the commission of the crime, the Court shall impose a surcharge of \$500.00 for each image or each copy of an image, as defined in 973.042(1), associated with the crime. The court shall determine the number of images or copies of images associated with the crime by a preponderance of the evidence and without a jury.

And furthermore, invoking the provisions of Wisconsin Statute Section 939.617, upon conviction the Court shall impose a bifurcated sentence including a term of initial confinement for at least three years.

PROBABLE CAUSE:

Your complainant is an officer with the Clintonville Police Department. Your complainant makes this complaint upon information and belief and upon reports and records of the Clintonville Police Department. Your complainant has relied upon these records in the past and has found them to be truthful and reliable.

Sgt. Bartel reports:

On January 27, 2026 Officer Lebreck retrieved evidence from the Appleton DCI field office. The items of evidence were devices which had been seized during the execution of search warrant executed in the city of Clintonville, Waupaca County. An additional warrant was executed in Dane County at the defendant's residence as well. The Dane County search warrant executed in Madison at ANDREW's residence resulted in seizure of additional devices which were also analyzed by DCI. Along with these devices were two storage devices containing separate items. One was a thumb drive containing the data from the devices in Madison and the other was a portable hard drive containing data from the devices obtained in Clintonville.

Over the following days, I did take time to review and examine the reports from each device. The devices from Madison clearly belonged to ANDREW as they had contained identifying information, including pictures from him. It was apparent however that these devices had not been used in several years as there was not new data attached to them. There were large amounts of pornography on these devices, however I did not conclude that there was any child sexual assault material on these devices.

I then examined the portable hard drive that I was given, which contained the devices that were obtained in Clintonville. These appeared to be full extractions of the cell phone, as well as the laptop. The laptop did not have much for significant data on it, as it appeared that this was used primarily for work purposes. I performed an extensive analysis of the cell phone, which was obtained from ANDREW. I was able to confirm that this was ANDREW's device through numerous means, such as it had unique information that was available only to him such as the regular usernames, as well as the conversations that I know ANDREW was having. There are also several hundred images of ANDREW, which were either saved in his gallery or as cached images. I was also able to find a picture of ANDREW's driver's license, as well as his passport, which in its totality would not be normal to have all this information on anyone else's device.

Once I was able to confirm that this absolutely was ANDREW's device, I did a further analysis of the information on the device. I was able to locate the conversation that ANDREW was having with the undercover account. The conversation on Telegram came in fragmented segments so it was not sequential in the Cellebrite reader, however it does appear that the total conversation was there. I had also come across several other conversations which were concerning as they did appear that ANDREW was talking to someone younger in age. I was unable to confirm any age of these people that he was talking to in these conversations as no age was mentioned. It does appear that he had originally

met these people on other apps or websites, but I was unable to confirm where he had originally met these people. Since I am not able to narrow down where exactly these conversations originated from, I am unable to trace the lead back to its originating point to determine if this was a conversation with anyone under the age of 18.

ANDREW also had large amounts of conversations where he was attempting to exchange money for sexual services. It does appear that he had taken the steps to meet with these females engaging in prostitution. Based on the conversations however it is unclear if he had actually gone through with the exchange. Also, based on the timeline and cached images, it does appear that ANDREW was more regular in his searches of teenage pornography in the weeks leading up to his arrest. This pornography is legal, however it does show his attraction to younger appearing women.

I was able to go through the images which were stored on ANDREW's device as well as the cached images. There were thousands of pornographic images and several which were concerning. There were what I estimated to be a few dozen images of females which would be around the 18-year-old mark. These images were of these females fully clothed and not in sexually suggested positions however it does show a pattern that ANDREW was regularly looking for images of female persons significantly younger than himself. ANDREW also had an application installed on his device where the purpose was to connect older men with younger female persons. This is consistent with the behaviors he was engaging in.

I was also able to identify several pornographic images which had questionable displays in them. Most of these images I was able to identify two images that were accessed and viewed by ANDREW which appeared to show females under the age of 18. The first image shows it was accessed on August 16th, 2025 at 11:32AM universal standard time. This image is stored with the device file name: 4C500D743DD48E13009BD3FB78EE501C04E05FA9. It shows a female with her legs spread facing the camera showing her genitals. She was also holding a piece of paper on which are handwritten the words "little fuck 14". Based on my examination of the image contents it appears that the person depicted is in the early stages of puberty based on the genital development and general signs of youth. I estimate the age of the person to be approximately 14-15 years of age. The second image was accessed on August 18th, 2025 at 4:15PM, universal standard time. The device file name of the image is: 7C6F6CBA2DBEA58F5B2D6F1E7DA39C4CDD048E66. The image shows a close up of a female's buttocks and while the female is engaged in sexual intercourse with what appears to be an adult male. The female appears to be very young based on the size and development of the hips and butt area. The male hand also appears to be very large in comparison to this female body. Based on these identifiers I would estimate the age of the female to be approximately 10 years old.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on 03/27/26
Electronically Signed By:
Chuck J Simono
Assistant District Attorney
State Bar #: 1030774

Electronically Signed By:
M. Wright
Complainant