

SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Commonwealth v. Jones, Kewuan Kantrell

2025 Pa. Super. 275 · No. 230 MDA 2025 · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The Pennsylvania Superior Court affirmed Kewuan Kantrell Jones's judgment of sentence for robbery, theft by unlawful taking, and simple assault. The court held that the Commonwealth was not required to present expert testimony to introduce Google Maps GPS timeline data from Jones's devices because the detective merely relayed information automatically calculated and displayed by the application, without offering specialized technical opinions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Superior Court of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lane; Olson; Murray
JURISDICTION	Pennsylvania Superior Court
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	230 MDA 2025
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Jones appealed from the judgment of sentence entered after a jury convicted him of robbery, theft by unlawful taking, and simple assault. He challenged the admission of Google Maps GPS timeline data through the lay testimony of a police detective.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Superior Court reviewed the trial court's evidentiary ruling for abuse of discretion. An abuse of discretion requires more than an error of judgment; it involves an overriding misapplication of law, a manifestly unreasonable exercise of judgment, or a decision resulting from bias, prejudice, ill will, or partiality.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and precedential Pennsylvania Superior Court opinion
PARTIES	Kewuan Kantrell Jones v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

TOPICS

- expert testimony
- authentication
- evidence
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

evidence

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Commonwealth was required to present expert testimony before introducing Google Maps GPS timeline data recovered from Jones's cell phone and tablet.
2. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by admitting screenshots and testimony concerning the Google Maps GPS timeline data through a police detective's lay testimony.

HOLDINGS

1. Expert testimony was not required because the detective merely relayed GPS timeline information automatically calculated, stored, and displayed by the Google Maps application and did not offer scientific, technical, or other specialized opinions.
2. The apparent inconsistencies in the Google Maps timeline affected the weight and credibility of the evidence, not its admissibility, where the Commonwealth presented evidence sufficient to show that the screenshots were what it claimed them to be.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We hold that the Commonwealth did not need to present an expert to submit this data into evidence, as the testifying officer who introduced it as a lay witness at trial did not offer any scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge, but merely relayed GPS data that the Google Maps app automatically calculated, stored, and made readily-available to its users in the form of a personalized travel timeline." (2025 Pa. Super. 275, at 1)

"Thus, we conclude the trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting screenshots of Jones' Google Maps GPS timeline data into evidence absent expert testimony, and we hold Jones' sole issue on appeal is without merit." (2025 Pa. Super. 275, at 21)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

During an early-morning robbery at a Turkey Hill convenience store, the masked robber took \$303.93 and cigarettes from the cash register. Police later seized Jones's cell phone and tablet pursuant to search warrants and found that his Google Maps account contained GPS timeline data placing the devices near the crime scene at the time of the robbery and later at a Sheetz store. A detective accessed the Google Maps timeline feature, photographed the displayed information, and testified about it as a lay witness; the defense identified apparent inconsistencies in some distances and travel times.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County denied Jones's motion in limine seeking to exclude Google Maps GPS timeline data absent expert testimony. Following trial, the jury convicted Jones, and the trial court imposed an aggregate sentence of ten to twenty years' imprisonment, along with a consecutive probation-

revocation sentence in a separate matter. Jones timely appealed, and the Superior Court affirmed the judgment of sentence.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Commonwealth v. Smith, 325 A.3d 513, 518-19 (Pa. 2024)
- Commonwealth v. Grubbs, 330 A.3d 444, 452 (Pa. Super. 2025)
- Commonwealth v. Manivannan, 186 A.3d 472, 485, 488 (Pa. Super. 2018)
- Commonwealth v. Carpenter, 264 A.3d 366 (Pa. Super. 2021) (unpublished memorandum)
- Commonwealth v. Montalvo-Rivera, 341 A.3d 159, 173 (Pa. Super. 2025)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/pennsylvania-superior-court-superior-court-of-pennsylvania/2025/commonwealth-v-jones-kewuan-kantrell-guekmw5x>