

Circuit Court for Baltimore City  
Case No. 124012001

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2346

September Term, 2024

---

DWAN M. QUINN

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

---

Friedman,  
Kehoe, Stephen H.,  
Kenney, James A., III  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: May 14, 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 Baltimore City of possession of cocaine with intent to distribute and possession of cocaine, Dwan M. Quinn, appellant, presents for our review a single issue: whether the evidence is sufficient to sustain the conviction of possession of cocaine with intent to distribute. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

At trial, the State produced evidence that at approximately 6:00 p.m. on December 19, 2023, Baltimore City Police Officer Ockive Farquharson and Detective Anthony Bennett were on patrol in the 1800 block of North Montford Avenue when they observed a Chrysler Town & Country minivan “fail[] to come to a complete stop” at a stop sign. The officers conducted a traffic stop of the minivan, which was driven by Mr. Quinn. During the stop, Officer Farquharson was informed that Mr. Quinn “ha[d] a warrant,” and arrested Mr. Quinn. Detective Bennett searched Mr. Quinn’s person and discovered “white rock like substances, consistent with crack cocaine, that were bagged up individually.” The detective also discovered approximately \$400 “in small denominations, 20’s, 10’s, 5’s, [and] singles.”

The State called Jamie Brunner, who testified that she is “a forensic scientist for the Baltimore Police Department in the Drug Analysis Unit.” Ms. Brunner inventoried and analyzed the “items” provided to her, “which [she] described as black resealable bags containing white rock substance, . . . 23 of them,” and “found that that item contained cocaine.” During cross-examination, the following colloquy occurred:

[DEFENSE COUNSEL:] You don’t test all 23 bags[], right?

[MS. BRUNNER:] No, I do not. We perform sample selection, which allows us to analyze one unit of a homogeneous population. So upon visual inspection of this unit, all of the containers appeared the same. They were all the same size, color, black bag, and they all contained a white rock substance, and so we can call that a homogeneous population and just sample one of that population.

[DEFENSE COUNSEL:] And you didn't weigh each individual bag, did you?

[MS. BRUNNER:] No. I took a gross weight, which would be the weight of all 23 of these units, and then I took an initial and final weight of the one unit that I analyzed.

Ms. Brunner testified that “[t]he initial weight of the one unit that [she] tested was” 0.4 grams, and that “the gross weight of all 23 was” 7.89 grams.

The State also called Detective Bennett, who confirmed that he had participated in approximately thirty to forty “arrests that resulted in the recovery of . . . controlled dangerous substances” (“CDS”), “had the occasion to speak with arrested individuals in regards to the packaging and sale techniques regarding CDS,” “had the occasion to speak with arrested individuals or informants about the packaging and sale of CDS . . . in Baltimore City,” “had the occasion to speak with arrested individuals or informants about the distribution of CDS in Baltimore City,” had “been an author of a warrant that involved CDS and/or guns,” “had the opportunity to participate in the execution of a search and seizure warrant that included drugs and[/]or guns,” and had “become familiar with how drugs are packaged and sold in Baltimore City.” When asked “how drugs are normally packaged in Baltimore City,” the detective testified: “Usually they’re in glass bottles or plastic jug, flip-top jugs. Occasionally they’re also in little plastic baggies.” When asked “how . . . a street sale [is] typically conducted,” Detective Bennett testified: “Usually the

dealer has his supply, whether it be vials or jugs. They'll conduct a hand-to-hand transaction, where they will hand off the product to the buyer in exchange for U.S. currency." The detective confirmed that he was "familiar with how suspected cocaine normally looks like in Baltimore City," and testified that "normally it's like a white rock substance." The State twice moved to admit Detective Bennett "as an expert in the area of observing and identifying, packaging and street-level distribution of controlled dangerous substances in Baltimore City," but the court sustained defense counsel's objections to such admission.

Mr. Quinn contends that "[w]ithout any expert testimony about cocaine use and distribution, and where only one bag weighing 0.4 grams was confirmed to contain cocaine, the items recovered from [him] are insufficient to sustain a finding that he intended to distribute cocaine." We disagree. While "[e]xpert testimony may be admitted, in the form of an opinion or otherwise, if the court determines that the testimony will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue," Rule 5-702, Mr. Quinn does not cite any authority that requires the State to produce such testimony, or that precludes the trier of fact from finding that a defendant intended to distribute a controlled dangerous substance unless the State produces expert testimony as to that intent. Also, we have stated that "[i]n Maryland, no specific quantity of drugs has been delineated that distinguishes between a quantity from which one can infer [intent] and a quantity from which one cannot make such an inference." *Purnell v. State*, 171 Md. App. 582, 612 (2006) (citations omitted). Here, the State produced evidence that Detective Bennett discovered on Mr. Quinn's person 23 bags weighing a total of nearly eight grams and each containing

a “white rock substance.” Mr. Quinn was also in possession of approximately \$400 in currency of four different denominations. Ms. Brunner tested the substance inside one of the bags and determined it to be cocaine. Finally, Detective Bennett testified that from his experience in participating in “arrests that resulted in the recovery of” CDS, speaking with “arrested individuals or informants” about “packaging and sale techniques regarding CDS,” “packaging and sale of CDS . . . in Baltimore City,” and “distribution of CDS in Baltimore City,” authoring “of a warrant that involved CDS and/or guns,” and participating “in the execution of a search and seizure warrant that included drugs and[/]or guns,” he had learned that in Baltimore City, drugs are occasionally packaged in “in little plastic baggies,” a “dealer” will typically “hand off the product to the buyer in exchange for U.S. currency,” and cocaine “normally looks like” a “white rock substance.” From this evidence, a rational trier of fact could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that all of the bags discovered on Mr. Quinn’s person contained cocaine, and that Mr. Quinn intended to distribute the cocaine. Hence, the evidence is sufficient to sustain the conviction of possession of cocaine with intent to distribute.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT  
FOR BALTIMORE CITY AFFIRMED.  
COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**