

APPELLATE COURT OF MARYLAND

Teshan Dion Jordan v. State of Maryland

No. 2437, September Term, 2023 (Md. App. Jan. 30, 2026) · No. No. 2437, September Term, 2023 · Decided January 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Court of Maryland held that the trial court properly admitted evidence of two additional stolen USPS arrow keys recovered from vehicles linked to Teshan Dion Jordan. The evidence was specially relevant under Maryland Rule 5-404(b) to establish Jordan’s identity, motive for robbing a mail carrier, and distinctive modus operandi in a related mail-theft scheme. The court affirmed Jordan’s convictions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Appellate Court of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Harrell, J.; Ripken; Kehoe, S.; Harrell; Glenn, T., Jr. (Senior Judge, specially assigned)
JURISDICTION	Maryland
DECIDED	January 30, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2437, September Term, 2023
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Jordan appealed his Howard County convictions for robbery with a dangerous weapon, use of a firearm in a crime of violence, theft, and related offenses, challenging the admission of evidence concerning two other stolen USPS arrow keys under Maryland Rule 5-404(b).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether other-acts evidence falls within a special-relevance exception to Maryland Rule 5-404(b) is reviewed without deference. The clear-and-convincing-evidence component is reviewed under the applicable evidentiary standard, and the trial court's Rule 5-403 balancing of probative value against unfair prejudice is reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Teshan Dion Jordan v. State of Maryland

TOPICS

evidence

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

preservation of error

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal evidence

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Jordan preserved his challenge under Maryland Rule 5-404(b) to the admission of evidence concerning two other stolen USPS arrow keys.
2. Whether the two other stolen arrow keys were intrinsic to the charged offenses.
3. Whether the other-keys evidence was specially relevant under Maryland Rule 5-404(b) to establish Jordan's identity, motive for the Fowlkes robbery, or modus operandi for the mailbox-theft scheme.
4. Whether the State established Jordan's involvement in the other acts by clear and convincing evidence.
5. Whether the probative value and necessity of the other-keys evidence were substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. Jordan preserved his challenge to the admission of the other-keys evidence by objecting before trial, renewing the objection when the evidence was introduced, and consistently arguing that the evidence suggested he committed other crimes.
2. The two other stolen arrow keys were not intrinsic to the charged robbery and mailbox-theft offenses because those offenses could be fully shown and explained without evidence of the additional keys.
3. The other-keys evidence was specially relevant under Maryland Rule 5-404(b) because it helped establish Jordan's identity as a participant in both the Fowlkes robbery and the related mailbox-theft scheme.
4. Using an arrow key stolen from a USPS mail carrier to repeatedly access mailboxes along the key's associated route was sufficiently unusual and distinctive to constitute a modus operandi relevant to identity.
5. The State established by clear and convincing evidence that Jordan possessed the two other stolen arrow keys.
6. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in determining that the limited other-keys evidence was more probative and necessary than unfairly prejudicial.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We agree with the trial court that using an arrow key stolen from a USPS mail carrier to steal repeatedly from mailboxes along the postal route linked to that key constitutes a sufficiently distinctive modus operandi to constitute earmarked or signature crimes." (34-35)

"The trial court did not err or abuse its discretion in admitting limited evidence that police recovered two other stolen arrow keys in the black GLC linked to Jordan, to prove his motive for the robbery and modus

operandi for the theft scheme.” (41)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

USPS carrier Lakesha Fowlkes was robbed at gunpoint and forced to surrender a unique USPS arrow key used to open collection boxes along her route. The key was subsequently used in repeated mailbox thefts, and police linked Jordan to the scheme through vehicles, phone and location data, social-media records, and accomplice testimony. After Jordan and accomplice Camron Mattocks fled from police, officers recovered the Fowlkes Key from Mattocks's vehicle and two additional stolen USPS arrow keys from a vehicle associated with Jordan. The trial court admitted limited evidence concerning the two additional keys but barred details about the unrelated robberies or thefts in which they allegedly were obtained.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury in the Circuit Court for Howard County convicted Jordan of offenses arising from the armed robbery of USPS carrier Lakesha Fowlkes and a related mailbox-theft scheme. The trial court admitted limited evidence that police recovered two other stolen USPS arrow keys from a vehicle linked to Jordan, while excluding evidence concerning the robberies or thefts associated with those keys. The Appellate Court of Maryland held that the Rule 5-404(b) objection was preserved and affirmed the convictions.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Danshin v. State, 491 Md. 520, 525 n.3 (2025)
- United States v. Ostrander, 114 F.4th 1348, 1356 (11th Cir. 2024)
- Browne v. State, 486 Md. 169, 187-98, 208 (2023)
- Wynn v. State, 351 Md. 307, 317-18 (1998)
- State v. Faulkner, 314 Md. 630, 634-41 (1989)
- Crawford v. State, 265 Md. App. 374, 393-96 (2025)
- Odum v. State, 412 Md. 593, 610-15 (2010)
- Terry v. State, 332 Md. 329, 334 (1993)
- Hart v. State, 260 Md. App. 491, 528 & n.24 (2024)
- Wimbish v. State, 201 Md. App. 239, 261 (2011)
- Smith v. State, 176 Md. App. 64, 70 n.3 (2007)
- Klauenberg v. State, 355 Md. 528, 541 (1999)
- Jeffries v. State, 113 Md. App. 322, 340-42 (1997)
- Dixon v. State, 133 Md. App. 325, 330-31 (2000), rev'd on other grounds, 364 Md. 209 (2001)
- Smith v. State, 232 Md. App. 583, 600 (2017)
- Freeman v. State, 259 Md. App. 212, 256 (2023)

- Wilder v. State, 191 Md. App. 319, 335, 344 (2010)
- Marshall v. State, 213 Md. App. 532, 546 (2013)
- Molina v. State, 244 Md. App. 67, 133-35 (2019)
- Wagner v. State, 213 Md. App. 419, 459-60 (2013)
- McKinney v. State, 82 Md. App. 111, 124 (1990)
- Faulkner v. State, 314 Md. 630, 636-40 (1989)
- Hart v. State, 260 Md. App. 491, 528 (2024)
- Nasim v. State, 34 Md. App. 65, 77-78 (1976)
- McKnight v. State, 280 Md. 604, 613-14 (1977)
- State v. Jones, 466 Md. 142, 151 (2019)
- Molter v. State, 201 Md. App. 155, 171 (2011)
- Cross v. State, 282 Md. 468, 470, 474-77 (1978)
- State v. Jones, 284 Md. 232, 243-44 (1979)
- Woodlin v. State, 484 Md. 253, 265 (2023)
- Cousar v. State, 198 Md. App. 486, 516-18 (2011)