

Circuit Court for Washington County
Case No. C-21-CR-23-000636

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1987

September Term, 2024

JOHN HOLLIS REYNOLDS, IV

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

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

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: March 25, 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 Washington County of attempted robbery, John Hollis Reynolds, IV, appellant, presents for our review a single issue: whether the evidence is insufficient to sustain the conviction. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

At trial, the State called Miranda Carino, who testified that she is a teller at the “Sharpsburg branch” of the Bulldog Federal Credit Union. On August 3, 2023, Mr. Reynolds, who is Caucasian and was wearing “a black trench coat,” entered the credit union, “put a note down on the counter,” and “said something about hurrying up.” Ms. Carino “read the note,” which said “to get unmarked bills.” “[R]ight as that happened,” a man later identified as Keith Evans, who is African-American, “came in, . . . grabbed the note, and . . . told [Ms. Carino that] he was a member and . . . he wanted to do a transaction.” Ms. Carino testified:

. . . I messaged my manager telling her that I got a message from someone – or a note that said unmarked bills, but there was somebody else that wanted to do a transaction, and I asked her, “Should I pull my bait money?” And she said, “Yes,” so then I did. And then, I couldn’t remember exactly what he told me to do, like, what he wanted, so I had to go back out and ask him.

Ms. Carino subsequently gave Mr. Evans a “money order and . . . cash that he wanted out.”

Ms. Carino testified that she “was pretty nervous,” “[k]ind of confused,” and not “sure if [she] should get the money or not or what was happening.” When the prosecutor asked Ms. Carino what, “in her mind, . . . did that mean to [her] when [she] saw that note,” she replied: “Robbery.”

The State also called Ronda Fluker, who testified that she is the manager of the branch of the credit union. On August 3, 2023, Ms. Fluker “received a message from [Ms.

Carino] that she was given a note to hand over unmarked bills.” Ms. Fluker “immediately hit the alarm,” which “lets the police know that [the credit union’s employees] need them.” When Ms. Carino told Ms. Fluker that “a member came in behind him” and “want[ed] to do a transaction,” Ms. Fluker advised Ms. Carino “to process the member’s transactions.”

Ms. Fluker testified:

[A]fter maybe a minute or so, I waited in my office. I felt as if I needed to go check on my girls. I didn’t feel comfortable with them by themselves out there, so I went out to check on the girls. At that point is when I saw Mr. Hollis Reynolds trying to get behind the teller line, so when he saw me coming out, he then stopped what he was doing, went over [and] talked to the other gentlemen he was with at the time. I went back, asked the girls if they were okay, if they needed me. And at that time is when he left.

Ms. Fluker explained that “behind the teller line there is like a door, like a gate, and then there’s a latch that you have to hit to open it, so when [she] walked out, [Mr. Reynolds’s] arm was over trying to figure out how to open it.”

The State also called Maryland State Police Sergeant Darrell Thomas, who testified that he responded to the alarm from the credit union. Sergeant Thomas “came in the back entrance” of the credit union’s parking lot and “backed [his] vehicle into a spot . . . so [he] could kind of observe what was going on.” The sergeant saw “a smaller silver passenger car” with “a white male and a black male on the driver’s side.” The white male, who “had a hoodie on,” “leaned over and said something to the black male,” and “got into the car.” As Sergeant Thomas “was getting out of [his] vehicle,” the silver car “sped out of the parking lot.” When asked “what speed [the sergeant] would . . . estimate the vehicle was going when it pulled out of the parking lot,” he stated: “[I]t squealed tires coming out of there.”

Mr. Reynolds contends that because there was no “actual or implied threat of bodily harm,” “brandishing of a weapon,” or “evidence from which it could be inferred that [he] was carrying a weapon,” the “State failed to satisfy the constructive force element of robbery.” *See Coles v. State*, 374 Md. 114, 123 (2003) (“[t]he hallmark of robbery . . . is the presence of force or threat of force, the latter of which also is referred to as intimidation” (citation omitted)). But, Mr. Reynolds was convicted not of robbery, but of attempted robbery. “A person is guilty of an attempt when, with intent to commit a crime, he engages in conduct which constitutes a substantial step toward the commission of that crime.” *Hall, Cummings & Lubin v. State*, 233 Md. App. 118, 138 (2017) (quoting *Townes v. State*, 314 Md. 71, 75 (1988)). Here, Mr. Reynolds gave Ms. Carino a note “to get unmarked bills” and “said something about hurrying up.” Mr. Reynolds subsequently put his arm over the gate between the credit union’s lobby and “teller line” and “tr[ie]d to figure out how to open it.” When Sergeant Thomas subsequently arrived at the credit union and exited his vehicle, he saw a Caucasian male enter a car and exit the parking lot of the credit union so quickly that the car “squealed tires.” From this evidence, a rational trier of fact could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Reynolds intended to rob the credit union and took substantial steps toward the commission of that crime. Hence, the evidence is sufficient to sustain the conviction.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY
AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY
APPELLANT.**