

TENNESSEE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

State of Tennessee v. Cliesha D. Tedunjaye

No. W2025-00772-CCA-R3-CD (Tenn. Crim. App. Apr. 22, 2026) · No. W2025-00772-CCA-R3-CD · Decided April 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals reviewed convictions for DUI, DUI per se, possessing a handgun while under the influence, violating the open container law, and failing to maintain a lane of travel. The defendant argued that the evidence was insufficient to prove intoxication, particularly in light of missing dashcam footage, witness credibility issues, and medical evidence. The court held that the evidence was sufficient and affirmed the trial court’s judgments.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John W. Campbell, Sr., J.; Robert W. Wedemeyer, P.J.; Camille R. McMullen, J.
JURISDICTION	Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals
DECIDED	April 22, 2026
DOCKET	W2025-00772-CCA-R3-CD
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The defendant appealed as of right from judgments of the Madison County Circuit Court following jury convictions for DUI, DUI per se, possessing a handgun while under the influence, violating the open container law, and failing to maintain her lane of travel. She challenged the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the DUI, DUI per se, and handgun convictions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When reviewing a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, the appellate court asks whether, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. The State receives the strongest legitimate view of the evidence and all reasonable inferences; credibility determinations, the weight and value of evidence, and factual conflicts are resolved by the trier of fact.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals opinion

PARTIES

Cliesha D. Tedunjaye v. State of Tennessee

TOPICS

evidence

criminal procedure

standard of review

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal law

Criminal procedure

Evidence

Appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence was sufficient to support the defendant's conviction for DUI based on impairment.
2. Whether the evidence was sufficient to support the defendant's DUI per se conviction based on a blood alcohol concentration of .08 percent or more.
3. Whether the evidence was sufficient to support the defendant's conviction for possessing a handgun while under the influence of alcohol.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was sufficient for a rational jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Tedunjaye was impaired and that her blood alcohol concentration exceeded the statutory per se limit, thereby supporting the challenged convictions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When the sufficiency of the evidence is challenged on appeal, the relevant question of the reviewing court is “whether, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.”” (-7-)

“The trial court instructed the jury on the missing dashcam evidence, but the jury chose to accredit the testimony of the State’s witnesses and resolved any conflicts in favor of the State. Therefore, the evidence is sufficient to support the convictions.” (-9-)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

During an early-morning traffic stop, deputies observed Tedunjaye's vehicle swerving and crossing the fog line. The deputies testified that she displayed signs of impairment, including slurred speech, bloodshot eyes, unsteadiness, poor performance on field sobriety tests, and an admission that she had consumed a cup of alcohol; officers also found a partly full whiskey bottle and a handgun in her vehicle. A blood sample taken after her arrest showed a blood alcohol concentration of .108 gram percent, above Tennessee's .08 per se limit. The State's dashcam video of the stop was missing, but the jury received an instruction permitting it to infer that the absent evidence would have favored the defense.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A Madison County grand jury indicted Tedunjaye in August 2023 after a February 19, 2023 traffic stop. Before trial, the parties agreed that the appropriate remedy for the State's failure to preserve dashcam video was a Ferguson jury instruction, which the trial court gave. After a January 2025 jury trial and sentencing, the defendant appealed; the Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the judgments.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Ferguson, 2 S.W.3d 912 (Tenn. 1999)
- Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979)
- State v. Evans, 838 S.W.2d 185, 190-91 (Tenn. 1992)
- State v. Anderson, 835 S.W.2d 600, 604 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1992)
- State v. Williams, 657 S.W.2d 405, 410 (Tenn. 1983)
- State v. Pruett, 788 S.W.2d 559, 561 (Tenn. 1990)
- State v. Tuggle, 639 S.W.2d 913, 914 (Tenn. 1982)
- State v. Pendergrass, 13 S.W.3d 389, 392-93 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1999)
- State v. Dorantes, 331 S.W.3d 370, 379 (Tenn. 2011)