

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,
SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT**

People v. Augustus

2026 NY Slip Op 03317 · No. 2022-02296 · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Second Department affirmed Tyshawn Augustus's judgment of conviction for second-degree murder following a nonjury trial. The court held that the evidence was legally sufficient, the verdict was not against the weight of the evidence, and the sentence was not excessive.

OPINION

People v. Augustus 2026 NY Slip Op 03317

PER CURIAM.

People v Augustus - 2026 NY Slip Op 03317 skip to main content

It appears you are using Adblock. Please disable Adblock to best experience our website.

Law Reporting Bureau Home PageLaw Reporting Bureau

Thomas J.K. Smith, State Reporter

Court Decisions Resources About

HomeAll Court DecisionsDecisions

People v Augustus

2026 NY Slip Op 03317

May 27, 2026

Appellate Division, Second Department

Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431.

This decision is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports.

The People of the State of New York, respondent,

v

Tyshawn Augustus, appellant.

Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department

Decided on May 27, 2026

2022-02296, (Ind. No. 9089/12)

Mark C. Dillon, J.P.

Paul Wooten

Laurence L. Love

Elena Goldberg Velazquez, JJ.

Patricia Pazner, New York, NY (Sean H. Murray of counsel), for appellant.

Eric Gonzalez, District Attorney, Brooklyn, NY (Leonard Joblove, Julian Joiris, and Allison Marculitis of counsel), for respondent.

[*1]

DECISION & ORDER

Appeal by the defendant from a judgment of the Supreme Court, Kings County (Donald Leo, J.), rendered March 21, 2022, convicting him of murder in the second degree, after a nonjury trial, and imposing sentence.

ORDERED that the judgment is affirmed.

The defendant was convicted, after a nonjury trial, of murder in the second degree (Penal Law § 125.25[1]) in connection with the death of the victim,

who was found shot to death with a bullet wound on the back of his left shoulder.

Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution (*see* *People v Contes*, 60 NY2d 620, 621; *People v Rodriguez*, 242 AD3d 1124, 1124), we find that it was legally sufficient to establish the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, as the circumstantial evidence established a prima facie case as to his intent to kill the victim (*see* *People v Hughes*, 199 AD3d 937, 937-938; *People v Miller*, 81 AD3d 854, 854). Moreover, in fulfilling our responsibility to conduct an independent review of the weight of the evidence (*see* CPL 470.15[5]; *People v Danielson*, 9 NY3d 342, 348), we nevertheless accord great deference to the factfinder's opportunity to view the witnesses, hear the testimony, and observe demeanor (*see* *People v Baque*, 43 NY3d 26, 30; *People v Bleakley*, 69 NY2d 490, 495). Upon reviewing the record here, we are satisfied that the verdict of guilt was not against the weight of the evidence (*see* *People v Romero*, 7 NY3d 633, 644; *People v Rodriguez*, 242 AD3d at 1125). The defendant's homicidal intent could be inferred from, among other things, the close-range gunshot to the victim's shoulder where the muzzle of the gun was pointing down towards the victim's torso in the vicinity of vital organs and the surrounding circumstances (*see* *People v Hughes*, 199 AD3d at 938; *People v Fils-Amie*, 291 AD2d 358, 358-359; *People v Mason*, 254 AD2d 109, 109).

The sentence imposed was not excessive (*see* *People v Key*, 223 AD3d 755, 756; *People v Suite*, 90 AD2d 80, 88).

DILLON, J.P.,
WOOTEN, LOVE and GOLDBERG VELAZQUEZ, JJ., concur.

ENTER:

Darrell M. Joseph
Clerk of the Court

Court Decisions

All Court Decisions Official Reports Service Bound Volumes Decision Search

Resources

RSS Feeds Style Manual Citation Tools Opinion Formatting & Privacy Guidelines Opinion Selection Criteria Legal Research Portal Site Index

About

About the Law Reporting Bureau About our Operations Contact Us Twitter

Quick Contact Info

17 Lodge Street

Albany, NY 12207

Phone: (518) 453-6900

Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.

PER CURIAM.

People v Augustus - 2026 NY Slip Op 03317 skip to main content It appears you are using Adblock. Please disable Adblock to best experience our website. Law Reporting Bureau Thomas J.K. Smith, State Reporter Court Decisions Resources About Home All Court Decisions Decisions People v Augustus 2026 NY Slip Op 03317 May 27, 2026 Appellate Division, Second Department Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431. This decision is uncorrected and subject to revision before publication in the Official Reports. The People of the State of New York, respondent, v Tyshawn Augustus, appellant. Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Second Judicial Department Decided on May 27, 2026 2022-02296, (Ind. No. 9089/12) Mark C. Dillon, J.P. Paul Wooten Laurence L. Love Elena

Goldberg Velazquez, JJ. Patricia Pazner, New York, NY (Sean H. Murray of counsel), for appellant. Eric Gonzalez, District Attorney, Brooklyn, NY (Leonard Joblove, Julian Joiris, and Allison Marculitis of counsel), for respondent. [*1] DECISION & ORDER Appeal by the defendant from a judgment of the Supreme Court, Kings County (Donald Leo, J.), rendered March 21, 2022, convicting him of murder in the second degree, after a nonjury trial, and imposing sentence. ORDERED that the judgment is affirmed. The defendant was convicted, after a nonjury trial, of murder in the second degree (Penal Law § 125.25[1]) in connection with the death of the victim, who was found shot to death with a bullet wound on the back of his left shoulder. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution (see *People v Contes* , 60 NY2d 620, 621; *People v Rodriguez* , 242 AD3d 1124, 1124), we find that it was legally sufficient to establish the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, as the circumstantial evidence established a prima facie case as to his intent to kill the victim (see *People v Hughes* , 199 AD3d 937, 937-938; *People v Miller* , 81 AD3d 854, 854). Moreover, in fulfilling our responsibility to conduct an independent review of the weight of the evidence (see CPL 470.15[5]; *People v Danielson* , 9 NY3d 342, 348), we nevertheless accord great deference to the factfinder's opportunity to view the witnesses, hear the testimony, and observe demeanor (see *People v Baque* , 43 NY3d 26, 30; *People v Bleakley* , 69 NY2d 490, 495). Upon reviewing the record here, we are satisfied that the verdict of guilt was not against the weight of the evidence (see *People v Romero* , 7 NY3d 633, 644; *People v Rodriguez* , 242 AD3d at 1125). The defendant's homicidal intent could be inferred from, among other things, the close-range gunshot to the victim's shoulder where the muzzle of the gun was pointing down towards the victim's torso in the vicinity of vital organs and the surrounding circumstances (see *People v Hughes* , 199 AD3d at 938; *People v Fils-Amie* , 291 AD2d 358, 358-359; *People v Mason* , 254 AD2d 109, 109). The sentence imposed was not excessive (see *People v Key* , 223 AD3d 755, 756; *People v Suite* , 90 AD2d 80, 88). DILLON, J.P., WOOTEN, LOVE and GOLDBERG VELAZQUEZ, JJ., concur. ENTER: Darrell M. Joseph Clerk of the Court Court Decisions All Court Decisions Official Reports Service Bound Volumes Decision Search Resources RSS Feeds Style Manual Citation Tools Opinion Formatting & Privacy Guidelines Opinion Selection Criteria Legal Research Portal Site Index About About the Law Reporting Bureau About our Operations Contact Us Twitter Quick Contact Info 17 Lodge Street Albany, NY 12207 Phone: (518) 453-6900 Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.