

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 80

September Term, 2025

SAMAR LORENZO WILLIAMS

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Wells, C.J.,
Albright,
Meredith, Timothy E.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: February 20, 2026

*This is a per curiam opinion. Under Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Following a jury trial in the Circuit Court for Carroll County, Samar Lorenzo Williams, appellant, was convicted of distribution of cocaine, two counts of conspiracy to distribute cocaine, possession with intent to distribute cocaine, possession with intent to distribute fentanyl, possession with intent to distribute pregabalin, and other related drug offenses. His sole claim on appeal is that there was insufficient evidence to sustain his convictions for possession of fentanyl with intent to distribute and possession of pregabalin with intent to distribute because the State failed to prove that he had the intent to distribute. As appellant acknowledges, however, this contention is not preserved for appellate review as he did not raise it when making his motion for judgment of acquittal at the close of all the evidence. *See Peters v. State*, 224 Md. App. 306, 353 (2015) (“[R]eview of a claim of insufficiency is available only for the reasons given by [the defendant] in his motion for judgment of acquittal.” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).¹

Relying on *Testerman v. State*, 170 Md. App. 324 (2006), appellant asks us to conclude that his defense counsel’s failure to preserve this issue constituted ineffective assistance of counsel. However, “[p]ost-conviction proceedings are preferred with respect to ineffective assistance of counsel claims because the trial record rarely reveals why counsel . . . omitted to act, and such proceedings allow for fact-finding and the introduction of testimony and evidence directly related to allegations of the counsel’s ineffectiveness.” *Mosley v. State*, 378 Md. 548, 560 (2003). And, unlike in *Testerman*, we

¹ Although appellant does not specifically ask us to do so, we decline to exercise our discretion to engage in “plain error” review of this claim pursuant to Maryland Rule 8-131(a).

are not persuaded that the record in this case is sufficiently developed to permit a fair evaluation of appellant's claim that his defense counsel was ineffective. Consequently, *Testerman* does not require us to consider that claim on direct appeal, and we decline to do so.

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