

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1226

September Term, 2015

---

SUKARNO POSSQUILLE JONES

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: June 21, 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 of possession of heroin and possession of drug paraphernalia, in the Circuit Court for Harford County, Sukarno Possquille Jones, appellant, challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting his conviction for possession of heroin. Specifically, he claims his extrajudicial confession that he possessed heroin was not corroborated by independent evidence tending to establish the *corpus delicti* of that offense. *See Woods v. State*, 315 Md. 591, 615, 556 (1989) (“[I]t is . . . well settled that an extrajudicial confession of guilt by a person accused of crime, unsupported by other evidence, is not sufficient to warrant a conviction.” (citation omitted)).

Viewing “the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution and giving deference to all reasonable inferences drawn by the jury,” *Hall v. State*, 224 Md. App. 72, 80-81 (2015), as we are required to do, we conclude the State presented sufficient evidence to support appellant’s conviction. The police stopped a vehicle driven by appellant and arrested appellant after discovering a crack pipe in his seat. Appellant’s subsequent statement to the deputy that he had “received [a] capsule of heroin from his passenger” was corroborated by evidence that (1) the deputy located a clear capsule containing an off-white powdery substance in appellant’s pocket; (2) two “identical” capsules were located in a bag belonging to the passenger; and (3) a forensic analysis of the capsules found in the passenger’s bag concluded that those capsules contained heroin. *See Miller v. State*, 380 Md. 1, 46 (2004) (noting that the supporting evidence corroborating an extrajudicial confession “may be small in amount and is sufficient to establish the *corpus delicti* if, when considered in connection with the confession or admission, it satisfies the trier of facts beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense charged was committed and that the accused

committed it”); *Woods*, 315 Md. at 616 (“[I]t is not necessary that the evidence independent of the confession be full and complete or that it establish the truth of the *corpus delicti* beyond a reasonable doubt or by a preponderance of proof.” (quoting *Cooper v. State*, 220 Md. 183, 190 (1959))).

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