

COURT OF APPEALS OF OREGON

State v. Santana

346 Or. App. 770 (2026) · No. A184231 · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The Oregon Court of Appeals reversed Jordan Daniel Santana’s contempt conviction for allegedly violating a protective order by attacking the victim’s kingdom in an online game. The court held that the evidence was insufficient to support a finding that Santana acted willfully because the state did not establish that he knew the attacked kingdom belonged to the victim. The court did not reach whether the conduct constituted prohibited contact under the restraining order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lagesen, C. J.; Tookey, Presiding Judge; Lagesen, Chief Judge; Jacquot, Judge
JURISDICTION	Oregon Court of Appeals
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	A184231
DISPOSITION	reversed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed a judgment of conviction for contempt of court after the Lane County Circuit Court denied his motion for judgment of acquittal and found that he willfully violated a restraining order by attacking the victim's kingdom in an online game.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On review of a motion for judgment of acquittal, the court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the state and determines whether a rational trier of fact, making reasonable inferences, could find that the state proved the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. An inference becomes impermissible speculation when it requires too great an inferential leap or an impermissible stacking of inferences.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion; precedential
PARTIES	Jordan Daniel Santana v. State of Oregon

TOPICS

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

standard of review

evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal procedure

Appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence was sufficient to support a finding that defendant willfully violated the restraining order by attacking the victim's kingdom in an online game.
2. Whether defendant's in-game attack constituted prohibited contact under the restraining order.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was insufficient to support a finding that defendant willfully violated the restraining order because it did not permit a reasonable inference that defendant knew the kingdom he attacked belonged to the victim.
2. The court did not decide whether defendant's conduct qualified as prohibited contact within the meaning of the restraining order because the insufficiency of the evidence regarding willfulness independently required reversal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

““‘[W]illfully’ for purposes of ORS 33.015(2) meant, and means, intentionally and with knowledge that the act or omission was forbidden conduct.”” (774)

“Absent such evidence, under the circumstances present here, it would be impermissible speculation to find that defendant knew he was attacking the victim’s kingdom.” (775)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant and the victim had previously been roommates and had played the online game Dice Dreams together. After defendant moved out, the victim obtained a restraining order prohibiting defendant from contacting or attempting to contact her by mail, email, social media, or apps. After the victim later reinstalled Dice Dreams, she received an in-game notification that defendant had attacked her kingdom, but the state presented no evidence showing how the victim appeared in the game after reinstalling it or whether defendant could recognize the kingdom as hers.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The victim obtained a restraining order under the Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities Abuse Prevention Act. After the victim received an in-game notification that defendant had attacked her kingdom, defendant was charged with contempt of court. Following a bench trial, the circuit court denied defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal and found him guilty. The Oregon Court of Appeals reversed because the evidence did not support a reasonable finding that defendant knew he was attacking the victim's kingdom.

DISPOSITION

reversed

CASES CITED

- State v. Gonzalez-Valenzuela, 358 Or. 451, 453-54, 454 n. 1, 365 P.3d 116 (2015)
- State v. White, 211 Or. App. 210, 212, 218-19, 154 P.3d 124, adh'd to as clarified on recons., 213 Or. App. 584, 162 P.3d 336 (2007)
- State v. Bivins, 191 Or. App. 460, 467, 83 P.3d 379 (2004)
- State v. Crombie, 267 Or. App. 705, 710, 341 P.3d 841 (2014)
- State v. Arnold, 301 Or. App. 642, 646, 458 P.3d 725 (2020)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/oregon-court-of-appeals-court-of-appeals-of-oregon/2026/state-v-santana-bqhcszy0>