

SUPREME COURT OF NORTH DAKOTA

State of North Dakota v. Michael James Landen

2026 ND 38 · No. No. 20250305 · Decided February 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The North Dakota Supreme Court affirmed Michael James Landen’s criminal judgment after a jury found him guilty of terrorizing. The court held that sufficient evidence supported the conviction and summarily affirmed under North Dakota Rule of Appellate Procedure 35.1(a)(3).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of North Dakota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Lisa Fair McEvers, C.J.; Daniel J. Crothers; Jerod E. Tufte; Jon J. Jensen; Douglas A. Bahr
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of North Dakota
DECIDED	February 12, 2026
DOCKET	No. 20250305
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Landen appealed a criminal judgment entered after a jury found him guilty of terrorizing, arguing the trial evidence was insufficient to sustain the conviction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the evidence was sufficient to support the guilty verdict, applying the rule that the defendant must show the evidence permits no reasonable inference of guilt and that the court does not reweigh conflicting evidence or judge witness credibility.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and precedential
PARTIES	Michael James Landen v. State of North Dakota

TOPICS

- evidence
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- criminal evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence presented at trial was sufficient to sustain Landen’s terrorizing conviction.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was sufficient to support the guilty verdict because Landen did not establish that the evidence permitted no reasonable inference of guilt.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“stating the defendant must show the evidence permits no reasonable inference of guilt and we do not reweigh conflicting evidence or judge witness credibility” (¶ 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The trial evidence included a recording of the 911 call and body-camera footage of the incident underlying the terrorizing charge. The responding officer, the victim, and the victim’s brother testified about Landen’s conduct. The victim testified that Landen’s conduct caused the victim to be fearful.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found Landen guilty of terrorizing. The district court denied his motion for judgment of acquittal under Rule 29, N.D.R.Crim.P. Landen appealed, and the North Dakota Supreme Court summarily affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Haney, 2023 ND 227, ¶ 7, 998 N.W.2d 817

OPINION

MCEVERS, LISA K. FAIR, J.

IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA 2026 ND 38 State of North Dakota, Plaintiff and Appellee v. Michael James Landen, Defendant and Appellant No. 20250305 Appeal from the District Court of Ward County, North Central Judicial District, the Honorable Richard L. Hagar, Judge. AFFIRMED. Per Curiam. Tiffany M. Sorgen, Assistant State’s Attorney, Minot, ND, for plaintiff and appellee; on brief.

Jamie L. Schaible, Fargo, ND, for defendant and appellant; on brief. State v. Landen No. 20250305 Per Curiam. [¶1] Michael Landen appeals from a criminal judgment entered after a jury found him guilty of terrorizing. Landen argues the evidence presented at trial was insufficient to sustain a terrorizing conviction. [¶2] Evidence presented at trial included a recording of the 911 call and body camera footage of the incident giving rise to the terrorizing charge.

The responding officer, victim, and victim's brother were all present at the incident and testified at trial about Landen's conduct during the incident. The victim also testified to being fearful as a result of Landen's conduct during the incident. At trial, Landen moved under Rule 29, N.D.R.Crim.P., for a judgment of acquittal.

The district court denied the motion. After reviewing the record, we conclude there was sufficient evidence to support the guilty verdict. See *State v. Haney*, 2023 ND 227, ¶ 7, 998 N.W.2d 817 (stating the defendant must show the evidence permits no reasonable inference of guilt and we do not reweigh conflicting evidence or judge witness credibility).

We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(3). [¶3] Lisa Fair McEvers, C.J. Daniel J. Crothers Jerod E. Tufte Jon J. Jensen Douglas A. Bahr 1