

MISSISSIPPI COURT OF APPEALS

Carlos M. Jones a/k/a Carlos Jones v. State of Mississippi

No. 2024-KA-00760-COA · No. No. 2024-KA-00760-COA · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The Mississippi Court of Appeals affirmed Carlos Jones's convictions for capital murder, predicated on burglary, and armed robbery. The court rejected his Confrontation Clause challenge to a redacted codefendant statement, declined to resolve his ineffective-assistance claim on direct appeal, and held that he had not shown bad-faith loss of evidence. The opinion also addresses speedy-trial, firearm-evidence, sufficiency-of-the-evidence, prior-bad-acts, and cumulative-error arguments.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Mississippi Court of Appeals
WRITING FOR THE COURT	McCarty, J.; Barnes, C.J.; Carlton, P.J.; Wilson, P.J.; Westbrook, J.; McDonald, J.; Lawrence, J.; Emfinger, J.; Weddle, J.; Lassitter St. Pé, J.
JURISDICTION	Mississippi Court of Appeals
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2024-KA-00760-COA
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Jones appealed his Sunflower County Circuit Court convictions for capital murder, with burglary as the underlying felony, and armed robbery, together with firearm enhancements. He challenged the admission of a redacted codefendant confession, the denial of severance and speedy-trial motions, alleged loss or destruction of evidence, admission of firearm and prior-bad-act evidence, sufficiency of the evidence, and cumulative error.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed denial of a mistrial for abuse of discretion, denial of a motion to dismiss for de novo review, factual speedy-trial findings for clear error supported by substantial credible evidence, evidentiary rulings for abuse of discretion, and sufficiency of the evidence by viewing the evidence and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the verdict and asking whether any rational juror could find each element beyond a reasonable doubt. Ineffective-assistance

	claims on direct appeal were reviewed only if the record affirmatively showed constitutional ineffectiveness or that the claim was meritless.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Carlos M. Jones a/k/a Carlos Jones v. State of Mississippi

TOPICS

criminal procedure sixth amendment speedy trial evidence appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure constitutional law evidence appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether admission of codefendant Derrion Eloby's redacted testimonial statement, together with testimony describing it, violated Jones's federal or state Confrontation Clause rights.
2. Whether trial counsel was constitutionally ineffective for failing to move to sever Jones's trial from the trials of his codefendants.
3. Whether the State's loss, destruction, or mishandling of interview recordings, investigative notes, a shell casing, or the autopsy projectile violated due process and required a mistrial or dismissal.
4. Whether Jones's constitutional or Mississippi statutory speedy-trial rights were violated.
5. Whether admission of the firearm recovered from Eloby's vehicle was reversible error.
6. Whether the State presented sufficient evidence to support capital murder predicated on burglary despite the indictment's allegations that the burglary was intended to facilitate stealing, assault, and killing.
7. Whether testimony concerning codefendant Brown's prior robberies was improperly admitted under Mississippi Rule of Evidence 404(b) and unfairly prejudiced Jones.
8. Whether cumulative error required reversal.

HOLDINGS

1. The admission of Eloby's redacted statement, testimony describing the statement without naming Jones, and a limiting instruction did not violate Jones's federal or state Confrontation Clause rights.
2. The ineffective-assistance claim was dismissed without prejudice because the direct-appeal record was inadequate to resolve it; Jones may pursue the claim through post-conviction proceedings with the required permission.
3. Jones failed to establish a due process violation from the loss, destruction, or mishandling of evidence because he did not show apparent exculpatory value, inability to obtain comparable evidence, and bad-faith destruction.
4. Jones's constitutional right to a speedy trial was not violated.

5. Jones's statutory speedy-trial right was not violated because he failed to show actual prejudice in addition to any statutory noncompliance.
6. The firearm-admission issue was waived because Jones did not object when the firearm was introduced at trial.
7. The evidence was sufficient to support Jones's capital-murder conviction because the State proved that the defendants broke and entered the dwelling with the intent to commit at least one crime, namely theft, and that Williams was killed during the burglary.
8. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting evidence of Brown's other robberies for limited non-character purposes, including motive, intent, preparation, plan, and opportunity, with a limiting instruction that barred its use against Jones.
9. Cumulative error did not warrant reversal because the court found no trial errors.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“(1) the evidence in question must possess an exculpatory value that was apparent before the evidence was destroyed; (2) the evidence must be of such a nature that [Jones] would be unable to obtain comparable evidence by other reasonably available means; and (3) the prosecution’s destruction of the evidence must have been in bad faith.” (¶ 66)

“The Barker test requires consideration of the following factors: “(1) the length of delay; (2) the reason for delay; (3) whether the defendant asserted his right to a speedy trial; and (4) whether the defendant has been prejudiced by the delay.”” (¶ 77)

“only the intent to commit some crime, be it a felony or a misdemeanor, is an element of the crime of burglary.” (¶ 102)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In 2012, masked and armed intruders entered the Drew, Mississippi, home of Merio Harris and Nathan Williams during a planned robbery. Williams was shot during the robbery and later died from his injuries. Years later, codefendant Jabrandon Green entered a plea agreement and testified that Jones entered the home through a window and helped initiate the robbery, while codefendant Derrion Eloby shot Williams. The State also presented evidence concerning a firearm recovered from Eloby, although firearms testing could not determine whether the recovered projectile had been fired from that gun.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jones and three codefendants were indicted in 2015 for capital murder and armed robbery. After the original indictment was nolle prossed because of a defect, a second grand jury indicted them in 2021 for capital murder predicated on burglary and armed robbery, each with a firearm enhancement. The defendants were jointly tried from January 30 through February 2, 2024. The jury convicted Jones, the circuit court sentenced him to life imprisonment with parole eligibility for capital murder and ten years, suspended subject to five years of post-release supervision, for armed robbery, and the court denied his posttrial motion. The Mississippi Court of Appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Samia v. United States, 599 U.S. 635 (2023)
- Okhuysen v. City of Starkville, 333 So. 3d 573, 582 nn.4, 5 (Miss. Ct. App. 2022)
- Smith v. State, 986 So. 2d 290, 293, 299 (Miss. 2008)
- Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 686 (1984)
- Dartez v. State, 177 So. 3d 420, 422-23 (¶18) (Miss. 2015)
- Collins v. State, 221 So. 3d 366, 372 (¶19) (Miss. Ct. App. 2016)
- Carnley v. State, 348 So. 3d 1071, 1079 (¶38) (Miss. Ct. App. 2022)
- Ellison v. State, 370 So. 3d 807, 815 (¶35) (Miss. Ct. App. 2023)
- Dorsey v. State, 310 So. 3d 1238, 1247 (¶26) (Miss. Ct. App. 2021)
- Young v. State, 281 So. 3d 179, 186 (¶29) (Miss. Ct. App. 2019)
- Hutto v. State, 227 So. 3d 963, 984 (¶66) (Miss. 2017)
- Lewis v. State, 295 So. 3d 521, 531 (¶26) (Miss. Ct. App. 2019)
- Northup v. State, 793 So. 2d 618, 623 (¶16) (Miss. 2001)
- Robinson v. State, 247 So. 3d 1212, 1234 (¶56) (Miss. 2018)
- Childs v. State, 133 So. 3d 348, 350 (¶10) (Miss. 2013)
- Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)
- Newell v. State, 175 So. 3d 1260, 1269 (¶9) (Miss. 2015)
- Berryman v. State, 337 So. 3d 1116, 1126-31 (¶¶ 33-36, 53) (Miss. Ct. App. 2021)
- Stark v. State, 911 So. 2d 447, 450 (¶7) (Miss. 2005)
- McBride v. State, 61 So. 3d 138, 142, 147 (¶¶ 9, 35) (Miss. 2011)
- Courtney v. State, 275 So. 3d 1032, 1042 (¶¶ 27, 29) (Miss. 2019)
- Harris v. State, 174 So. 3d 314, 319 (¶¶ 23-24) (Miss. Ct. App. 2015)
- Bates v. State, 886 So. 2d 4, 8 (¶11) (Miss. 2004)
- Taylor v. State, 162 So. 3d 780, 785 (¶10) (Miss. 2015)
- Bateman v. State, 125 So. 3d 616, 630-31 (¶¶ 49, 51) (Miss. 2013)
- Moffett v. State, 49 So. 3d 1073, 1087 (¶39) (Miss. 2010)
- Reed v. State, 191 So. 3d 134, 141 (¶19) (Miss. Ct. App. 2016)
- Wall v. State, 718 So. 2d 1107, 1113 (¶26) (Miss. 1998)
- Price v. State, 898 So. 2d 641, 648 (¶11) (Miss. 2005)
- Smith v. State, 398 So. 3d 875, 890-91 (¶29) (Miss. Ct. App. 2023)
- Quinn v. State, 191 So. 3d 1227, 1233 (¶22) (Miss. 2016)
- Smith v. State, 250 So. 3d 421, 424-29 (¶¶ 12-14, 21-22, 27-28) (Miss. 2018)

- Cortez v. State, 876 So. 2d 1026, 1030 (¶¶ 12-13) (Miss. Ct. App. 2004)
- Maggett v. State, 230 So. 3d 722, 728 (¶13) (Miss. Ct. App. 2016)
- Culberson v. State, 419 So. 3d 926, 940 (¶59) (Miss. Ct. App. 2025)
- Parks v. State, 228 So. 3d 853, 868 (¶58) (Miss. Ct. App. 2017)
- Bradshaw v. State, 371 So. 3d 822, 836 (¶41) (Miss. Ct. App. 2023)
- Terry v. State, 412 So. 3d 1274, 1280-81 (¶¶ 28, 30) (Miss. Ct. App. 2025)
- Masters v. State, 285 So. 3d 192, 197 (¶16) (Miss. Ct. App. 2019)
- O'Connor v. State, 120 So. 3d 390, 398 (¶20) (Miss. 2013)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/mississippi-court-of-appeals-mississippi-court-of-appeals/2026/carlos-m-jones-a-k-a-carlos-jones-v-state-of-mississippi-sqlwylc0>