

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

State v. Macormac

No. 128,361 · No. No. 128,361 · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The Kansas Supreme Court affirmed the Sedgwick County District Court’s decision to impose consecutive sentences for Justin Earl Macormac’s first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter convictions. The court held that the district court did not abuse its discretion by briefly explaining that the two victims were each entitled to their own sentence, despite mitigating evidence concerning Macormac’s age, substance use, mental health, and potential for rehabilitation. The court concluded that a lengthy explanation was not required and that the consecutive sentences were not arbitrary, unreasonable, or based on an error of law or fact.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Standridge, J.
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of Kansas
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	No. 128,361
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Direct appeal from the denial of a motion for concurrent sentencing following consolidated guilty pleas and sentencing in the Sedgwick County District Court.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse of discretion. The appellant must show that the sentencing decision was arbitrary, fanciful, or unreasonable; based on an error of law; or based on an error of fact unsupported by substantial competent evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Kansas Supreme Court opinion
PARTIES	Justin Earl Macormac v. State of Kansas

TOPICS

- sentencing
- standard of review
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

sentencing

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court abused its discretion by ordering the sentences for first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter to run consecutively.
2. Whether the district court was required to provide a lengthy explanation addressing the defendant's mitigating evidence before imposing consecutive sentences.
3. Whether the consecutive sentences were unreasonable because the crimes allegedly involved less planning, brutality, or prolonged conduct than offenses in prior cases upholding consecutive sentences.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court did not abuse its discretion by ordering the first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter sentences to run consecutively. The court's determination that two victims were each entitled to their own sentence was a reasonable basis for imposing consecutive sentences.
2. A sentencing court need not provide a lengthy explanation or expressly discuss every mitigating factor when imposing consecutive sentences. The court must state its decision and the reasons for it on the record, but a brief explanation does not itself establish an abuse of discretion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The lack of a lengthy explanation by a district court ordering a defendant to serve sentences consecutively does not imply an impermissible basis for that decision constituting an abuse of discretion.” (at 8)

“But simply not being the worst of the worst does not require the lower court to order his sentences to run concurrent.” (at 10)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Macormac pleaded guilty to multiple violent offenses committed during approximately a one-year period, including first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter arising from the deaths of two people. He presented an expert report concerning the effects of long-term drug use, brain development, mental health, culpability, and potential rehabilitation. The district court acknowledged the report and defense submissions but ordered the first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter sentences to run consecutively because there were two victims, each entitled to an individual sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Macormac pleaded guilty to amended charges in four consolidated cases, including first-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter. The district court imposed a 620-month sentence for first-degree murder and a consecutive 233-month sentence for voluntary manslaughter, while running the other sentences concurrently. Macormac appealed, arguing that the court abused its discretion by failing to adequately consider mitigating evidence and by imposing consecutive sentences.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Goens, 317 Kan. 616, 619-21, 535 P.3d 1116 (2023)
- State v. Baker, 297 Kan. 482, 483-85, 301 P.3d 706 (2013)
- State v. Mitchell, 320 Kan. 775, 778, 780, 571 P.3d 604 (2025)
- State v. McNabb, 312 Kan. 609, 614, 478 P.3d 769 (2021)
- State v. Frecks, 294 Kan. 738, 742, 280 P.3d 217 (2012)
- State v. Brune, 307 Kan. 370, 370, 372-73, 409 P.3d 862 (2018)
- State v. Horn, 302 Kan. 255, 257-58, 352 P.3d 549 (2015)
- State v. Mosher, 299 Kan. 1, 2-4, 319 P.3d 1253 (2014)
- State v. Ross, 295 Kan. 1126, 1138-39, 289 P.3d 76 (2012)