

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE COURT

State v. Antwon B.

236 Conn. App. 428 (2025) · No. AC 48494 · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The Connecticut Appellate Court affirmed Antwon B.'s convictions for manslaughter in the first degree with a firearm, attempted assault in the first degree, and larceny in the third degree. The court held that sufficient evidence supported the attempted assault and larceny convictions. It also concluded that prosecutorial improprieties during examination and closing arguments did not deprive the defendant of a fair trial.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Connecticut Appellate Court
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bishop, J.; Elgo, J.; Wilson, J.
JURISDICTION	Connecticut Appellate Court
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	AC 48494
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The defendant appealed from a judgment of conviction following a jury trial for manslaughter in the first degree with a firearm, attempt to commit assault in the first degree, and larceny in the third degree. He challenged the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the attempted-assault and larceny convictions and claimed prosecutorial impropriety deprived him of a fair trial.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For sufficiency of the evidence, the court construes the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict and determines whether, on the facts and reasonable inferences so construed, the jury reasonably could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Prosecutorial-impropriety claims are reviewed under a two-step process: first, whether impropriety occurred; and second, whether it deprived the defendant of a fair trial. The prejudice inquiry considers the State v. Williams factors, including severity, frequency, centrality, curative measures, invitation by the defense, and the strength of the State's case.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published precedential opinion
PARTIES	Antwon B., defendant v. State of Connecticut

TOPICS

criminal procedure prosecutorial misconduct burden of proof standard of review appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law criminal procedure appellate advocacy

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence was sufficient to prove that the defendant intended to cause L serious physical injury and took a substantial step toward committing assault in the first degree.
2. Whether the evidence was sufficient to prove that the defendant wrongfully took Shavrek's Ford Explorer without the owner's knowing consent.
3. Whether the evidence was sufficient to prove that, when he took the vehicle, the defendant intended to deprive Shavrek of it permanently despite later leaving it at the police station.
4. Whether prosecutorial improprieties during cross-examination and closing and rebuttal arguments deprived the defendant of a fair trial.
5. Whether the prosecutor's limited use of first-person terms such as "we" and "us" improperly aligned the prosecutor with the jury or imposed a duty to convict.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was sufficient to support the conviction because the jury reasonably could credit L's testimony that the defendant pulled the trigger while holding the gun to her face and infer that he intended to shoot her and cause serious physical injury.
2. The evidence was sufficient for the jury to find that the defendant wrongfully took Shavrek's Ford Explorer without Shavrek's knowing consent.
3. The evidence was sufficient to establish that the defendant intended permanently to deprive Shavrek of the vehicle at the time he took it, even though the vehicle was later left at the police station.
4. The prosecutor improperly asked the defendant to comment on L's veracity, improperly referred during rebuttal to the defendant's responses to those questions, and improperly argued that the gun had jammed or misfired based on facts not in evidence. Nevertheless, the improprieties, individually and cumulatively, did not deprive the defendant of a fair trial.
5. The prosecutor's limited use of "we" and "us" did not constitute prosecutorial misconduct or deprive the defendant of a fair trial.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We conclude that the jury was free to credit L’s testimony that the defendant pulled the trigger the first time he first pointed the gun at her face and that the jury could reasonably have inferred from this evidence that the defendant intended to shoot L and cause her serious physical injury.” (236 Conn. App. 440)

“To be convicted of [larceny in the third degree], therefore, it is not necessary for the jury to find that the defendant actually kept the property in question, but rather, that at the moment he took the property he intended to retain it permanently.” (236 Conn. App. 448)

“In light of the foregoing, we conclude that the improprieties committed by the prosecutor during his cross-examination of the defendant and his closing and rebuttal closing arguments were minor and unimpactful and did not implicate the fairness of the trial.” (236 Conn. App. 466)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On October 22, 2019, the defendant encountered his former girlfriend, identified as L, with Leroy Jefferson in the stairwell of their apartment building. The defendant shot Jefferson repeatedly, then placed a firearm against L's face and pulled the trigger, although the gun did not fire; after reloading, he again placed it near her face before shooting Jefferson further. The defendant then drove to his workplace, took a Ford Explorer belonging to Brad Shavrek from an airport parking lot, drove it to a police station, and surrendered. At trial, L testified about the attempted shooting, while other evidence established the circumstances of the vehicle taking and the defendant's conduct after the shooting.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The State charged the defendant in the Superior Court for the judicial district of Hartford with murder, attempt to commit assault in the first degree with a firearm, and larceny in the third degree. After a jury trial, he was convicted of manslaughter in the first degree with a firearm, attempt to commit assault in the first degree, and larceny in the third degree, and received a total effective sentence of fifty years. The trial court denied oral and written motions for judgment of acquittal, and the Connecticut Appellate Court affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Lueders, 225 Conn. App. 612, 623-24, 317 A.3d 69, cert. denied, 349 Conn. 920, 321 A.3d 402 (2024)
- State v. Catchings, 170 Conn. App. 564, 570-72, 155 A.3d 236, cert. denied, 325 Conn. 909, 158 A.3d 319 (2017)
- State v. Carter, 317 Conn. 845, 852, 857-58, 120 A.3d 1229 (2015)
- State v. Turner, 24 Conn. App. 264, 268, 587 A.2d 1050, cert. denied, 218 Conn. 910, 591 A.2d 812 (1991)
- State v. Clark, 56 Conn. App. 108, 112, 741 A.2d 331 (1999)
- State v. Sanchez, 92 Conn. App. 112, 118, 884 A.2d 1, appeal dismissed, 282 Conn. 787, 924 A.2d 844 (2007)

- State v. Flowers, 161 Conn. App. 747, 752, 757, 129 A.3d 157, cert. denied, 320 Conn. 917, 131 A.3d 1154 (2015)
- State v. Spells, 76 Conn. App. 67, 90-91, 818 A.2d 808, cert. denied, 266 Conn. 901, 832 A.2d 67 (2003)
- State v. Anderson, 212 Conn. 31, 36-37, 561 A.2d 897 (1989)
- State v. Singh, 259 Conn. 693, 706, 793 A.2d 226 (2002)
- State v. Diaz, 348 Conn. 750, 771-72, 311 A.3d 714 (2024)
- State v. Warholic, 278 Conn. 354, 383, 897 A.2d 569 (2006)
- State v. Salamon, 287 Conn. 509, 565, 949 A.2d 1092 (2008)
- State v. Williams, 204 Conn. 523, 540, 529 A.2d 653 (1987)
- State v. Fasanelli, 163 Conn. App. 170, 188-89, 133 A.3d 921 (2016)
- Valentine v. Commissioner of Correction, 219 Conn. App. 276, 322, 295 A.3d 973, cert. denied, 348 Conn. 913, 303 A.3d 602 (2023)
- State v. Ancona, 270 Conn. 568, 608-09, 854 A.2d 718, cert. denied, 543 U.S. 1055, 125 S. Ct. 921, 160 L. Ed. 2d 780 (2005)
- State v. Fauci, 282 Conn. 23, 45, 917 A.2d 978 (2007)
- State v. Courtney G., 339 Conn. 328, 347-48, 361-65, 260 A.3d 1152 (2021)
- State v. Santiago, 269 Conn. 726, 762, 850 A.2d 199 (2004)
- State v. Dabate, 351 Conn. 428, 437, 331 A.3d 1159 (2025)
- State v. Maurice B., 228 Conn. App. 720, 726-29, 744, 324 A.3d 850, cert. denied, 350 Conn. 929, 326 A.3d 249 (2024)
- State v. Pernell, 194 Conn. App. 394, 410, 221 A.3d 457, cert. denied, 334 Conn. 910, 221 A.3d 44 (2019)
- State v. Mucha, 137 Conn. App. 173, 193, 47 A.3d 931, cert. denied, 307 Conn. 912, 53 A.3d 998 (2012)
- State v. Albino, 312 Conn. 763, 97 A.3d 478 (2014)
- State v. Mendoza, 49 Conn. App. 323, 327, 714 A.2d 1250, cert. denied, 247 Conn. 903, 720 A.2d 516 (1998)
- State v. Gibson, 302 Conn. 653, 660, 31 A.3d 346 (2011)
- State v. O'Brien-Veader, 318 Conn. 514, 547, 122 A.3d 555 (2015)
- JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Essaghof, 221 Conn. App. 475, 485, 302 A.3d 339, cert. denied, 348 Conn. 923, 304 A.3d 445 (2023)
- State v. Caballero, 49 Conn. App. 486, 492, 714 A.2d 1254, cert. denied, 247 Conn. 924, 719 A.2d 1170 (1998)
- State v. Sam, 98 Conn. App. 13, 35, 907 A.2d 99, cert. denied, 280 Conn. 944, 912 A.2d 478 (2006)