

Circuit Court for Howard County  
Case No. C-13-CR-23-000393

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1089

September Term, 2024

---

JENNIFER LYNN MOORMAN

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Graeff,  
Berger,  
Wright, Alexander, Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: April 1, 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.

Convicted by a jury in the Circuit Court for Howard County of first degree assault and related offenses, Jennifer Lynn Moorman, appellant, presents for our review a single issue: whether the evidence is insufficient to sustain the convictions. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgments of the circuit court.

At trial, the prosecutor, in opening statement, argued that “[o]n May 15th, 2023, [Ms.] Moorman orchestrated a series of events that led to a completely innocent bystander being terrorized at gunpoint by her fiancé Byron Hall.” Defense counsel conceded that Mr. Hall “did threaten someone with a gun” and “was the boyfriend of [Ms.] Moorman,” but contended that “[s]he didn’t know what was going to occur.”

The State subsequently called Donald Moore, who testified that he “help[s] out” at the Devail Car Wash at 9747 Washington Boulevard. On the afternoon of May 15, 2023, Ms. Moorman was in one of the bays of the car wash, drying the windows of her vehicle. Ms. Moorman was accompanied by two boys, who were approximately “[t]en to twelve years old.” A man approached Mr. Moore and asked if Ms. Moorman was finished and if Mr. Moore could “ask her to move.” When Mr. Moore asked Ms. Moorman to move her vehicle, she “got to shouting at” Mr. Moore. After some “shouting back and forth,” Ms. Moorman stated, “I’ll get my son for you, or something like that,” and “pulled out.” On a video recording made by a surveillance camera at the car wash, Mr. Moore identified a vehicle leaving the car wash at 7:02 p.m. as the “one that [he] had a disagreement with.”

Later that day, Mr. Moore looked across the street and saw, in the parking lot of a hotel, “the two little boys,” who were “just watching . . . the car wash” and Mr. Moore. At approximately 7:43 p.m., James Parker, who was a frequent customer of the car wash,

arrived at the car wash in his white “company van.” The State subsequently played for the jury a second video recording made by a surveillance camera at the car wash, which depicts a man holding a gun in his hand and approaching the driver’s door of Mr. Parker’s van. After Mr. Parker exited the front passenger door, the gunman pursued Mr. Parker around the rear of the van and down Washington Boulevard. The gunman subsequently turned away from Mr. Parker and departed. Mr. Moore identified on the video recording “the children [that he] saw across the street,” who were wearing “beige pants” and “some type of school uniform.” The State also called Mr. Parker, who identified on the video recording himself and his van.

The State also called Howard County Police Detective Christopher Attanasio, who testified that on May 15, 2023, he responded to the car wash for an “assault [where] an individual had came up and pointed a gun at another individual.” Detective Attanasio reviewed “still footage” recorded by the car wash’s surveillance cameras. “Patrol” subsequently notified the detective “that they had identified the owner of the vehicle” depicted in the footage as Ms. Moorman. “Through police databases,” Detective Attanasio was “able to find Ms. Moorman’s cellphone.” The detective was “advised that [Ms. Moorman] was on the phone during the time of the incident,” and “requested call detail records.” “Through those call detail records,” Detective Attanasio determined that “during the time of the incident,” Ms. Moorman “was talking to” Mr. Hall.

On the video recordings made by the car wash’s surveillance cameras, Detective Attanasio identified Ms. Moorman’s vehicle as leaving the car wash at 7:02 p.m. and “pull[ing] out to Route 1.” At 7:24 p.m., the “vehicle is across the street at America’s Best

Inn.” Ms. Moorman’s “two children . . . wound up exiting the vehicle but kind of walked back and forth in front of the hotel and down on the grassy area a little bit.” At 7:41 p.m., Ms. Moorman pulled her vehicle forward “and then . . . back[ed] it up towards the rear of the hotel” and facing Route 1. On “surveillance footage from the Parts Authority[,] which is the business right next door to the carwash,” Detective Attanasio observed “a suspect vehicle, Mr. Hall’s, . . . driving into the Parts Authority parking, [and] parking there before walking over towards the carwash.” After Mr. Hall “assaulted Mr. Parker,” “[b]oth kids got back in [Ms. Moorman’s] vehicle,” and she drove “behind the hotel.”

Detective Attanasio testified that he discovered from the “phone records” that Ms. Moorman “had contacted Mr. Hall multiple times during the course of the events.” The first call occurred from “about 6:15 to about roughly 7:26 p.m.,” which was “during the time that [Ms. Moorman was] in the carwash” and “across the street at the hotel.” From 7:26 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., Ms. Moorman placed five calls to Mr. Hall. At 7:31 p.m., Ms. Moorman placed a call to Mr. Hall that lasted “a little bit more than six” minutes. At 7:38 p.m., Mr. Hall placed a call to Ms. Moorman that lasted “just over 28 minutes.”

On June 29, 2023, Detective Attanasio executed a search warrant at Ms. Moorman’s residence. At the time, Ms. Moorman, Mr. Hall, and Ms. Moorman’s children were “in the residence.” The detective testified:

During that time, it was relayed to us that Ms. Moorman had an altercation with Mr. Moore where she said something to him. Ms. Moorman interjected and said that actually Mr. Moore said something to her and threatened her.

So, at that point I then asked Ms. Moorman if she had called the police. She advised that she did not. I then stated that we were able to obtain

her phone records. From her phone records, we identified Mr. Hall – and we identified Mr. Hall. We then saw him come up from the Parts Authority, walk up to the carwash and assault a totally innocent victim.

It was at that point that Ms. Moorman advised that, oh, I told him it was the wrong guy.

Following the close of the State’s case, Ms. Moorman called Mr. Hall, who testified that he was “on the phone” with Ms. Moorman at the time that she argued with Mr. Moore. After Mr. Hall told Ms. Moorman to go to the “hotel across the street,” he went home and “grabbed [a] gun.” Mr. Hall then went to the car wash, where he “approached a man in [a] vehicle” and told him “to get out the car.” After “the passenger side door open[ed],” Mr. Hall “proceeded to come around” and told the man: “[I]f you ever see this woman again, don’t you ever say anything to her again.” Mr. Hall testified that “[n]o one knew [that he] had a gun,” and no one had “conspire[d] with [him] and come up with a plan . . . to go to the carwash with a gun.”

Following Mr. Hall’s testimony, Ms. Moorman testified that while she was at the car wash and “on the phone,” Mr. Moore “confronted” her. Mr. Hall subsequently told Ms. Moorman that he was “on the way” and to “[g]o across the street.” Ms. Moorman “went across the street [to] the hotel,” where she “waited . . . with [her] two sons.” Ms. Moorman confirmed that she did not “come up with a plan with . . . Mr. Hall . . . or anyone else that they should come to the car wash to assault someone,” and did not “tell anyone to go to the car wash to commit an assault.”

Ms. Moorman contends that the evidence is insufficient to sustain the convictions because the “State failed to prove [her] involvement as an accomplice beyond a reasonable

doubt.” We disagree. The Supreme Court of Maryland has stated that “to be an accomplice a person must participate in the commission of a crime knowingly, voluntarily, and with common criminal intent with the principal offender, or must in some way advocate or encourage the commission of the crime.” *Silva v. State*, 422 Md. 17, 28 (2011) (internal citations, quotations, and brackets omitted). Here, the State presented evidence that after “shouting back and forth” with Mr. Moore, Ms. Moorman told him that she would “get [someone] for” him. Instead of leaving the area of the car wash, Ms. Moorman drove to the hotel across the street from the car wash and parked within sight of it and Mr. Moore. At the hotel, Ms. Moorman’s children exited the car and watched the car wash and Mr. Moore. During the assault, Ms. Moorman stayed in her vehicle. After the assault, Ms. Moorman’s children re-entered her vehicle, and she drove the vehicle behind the hotel. From the time of Ms. Moorman’s altercation with Mr. Moore until Mr. Hall’s departure from the car wash, Ms. Moorman stayed in near-constant contact with Mr. Hall. When Detective Attanasio spoke to Ms. Moorman at her residence, she admitted that did not call the police to report that Mr. Moore had “threatened her.” Finally, when the detective told Ms. Moorman that Mr. Hall had “assault[ed] a totally innocent victim,” Ms. Moorman replied not that she had no knowledge of Mr. Hall’s intent, but that he had assaulted “the wrong guy.” From this evidence, a rational trier of fact could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Ms. Moorman participated in the assault of Mr. Moore knowingly, voluntarily,

and with common criminal intent with Mr. Hall, and in some way advocated or encouraged the commission of the crime. Hence, the evidence is sufficient to sustain the convictions.

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