

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2016

September Term, 2015

---

WILLIAM AARON TEAT

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Krauser, C.J.,  
Nazarian,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Retired, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: July 22, 2016

\*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

Convicted by a jury, in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, of illegal possession of a regulated firearm, carrying a handgun and illegal discharge of a firearm, William Aaron Teat, appellant, challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting his convictions. Specifically, he claims that the State failed to prove that he was in possession of a handgun or firearm.

“The standard for our review of the sufficiency of the evidence is ‘whether, after reviewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.’” *Neal v. State*, 191 Md. App. 297, 314, *cert. denied*, 415 Md. 42 (2010) (citation omitted). “The test is ‘not whether the evidence *should have or probably would have* persuaded the majority of the fact finders but only whether it *possibly could have* persuaded *any* rational fact finder.’” *Painter v. State*, 157 Md. App. 1, 11 (2004) (citations omitted). In applying the test, “[w]e defer to the fact finder’s ‘opportunity to assess the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence, and resolve conflicts in the evidence.’” *Neal, supra*, 191 Md. App. at 314 (citation omitted). We “consider circumstantial evidence as well as direct evidence” and note that “circumstantial evidence alone is ‘sufficient to support a conviction, provided the circumstances support rational inferences from which the trier of fact could be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the accused.’” *Painter, supra*, 157 Md. App. at 11 (citation omitted).

Viewing “the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution,” as we are required to do, we conclude the State presented sufficient evidence, both direct and circumstantial, to support Teat’s convictions. The jury could have reasonably found that

Teat was in possession of a handgun based on the following evidence: (1) police received a call for shots fired at 10:15 p.m. in the vicinity of Clay and Pleasant Streets; (2) video surveillance of that intersection, at that exact time, showed Teat removing a dark object from his pocket, waving it in the air and appearing to fire shots into the air, then “racking the slide of the weapon” and running away; (3) testimony of Detective Sauriol-Gibris that, based on her training and experience with firearms, the object appellant was holding in the video was a handgun; (4) Teat attempted, after his arrest, to wipe his hands off on nearby vegetation, in what the prosecution described as an attempt to remove gunshot residue from his hands; and (5) bullet casings were recovered the next day on the street where Teat was seen on video firing the handgun. *See Brown v. State*, 182 Md. App. 138, 166-67 (2008) (holding that “tangible evidence in the form of a weapon is not necessary to sustain a conviction; the weapon’s identification can be established by testimony or by inference.”)

**JUDGMENTS OF THE CIRCUIT COURT  
FOR ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY  
AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY  
APPELLANT.**