

COURT OF APPEALS OF ARKANSAS

Jasmine Leigh Chambers v. State of Arkansas

Chambers, 2026 Ark. App. 69 (Ark. Ct. App. 2026) · No. CR-25-60 · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The Arkansas Court of Appeals affirmed Jasmine Leigh Chambers’s conviction for possession of more than two grams of methamphetamine with the purpose to deliver. The court held that, because the conviction was based on accomplice liability, Chambers’s challenge concerning actual or constructive possession did not address the theory supporting the verdict. Her failure to develop an argument contesting accomplice liability precluded appellate review.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Arkansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Wendy Scholtens Wood; Hixson; Brown
JURISDICTION	Arkansas Court of Appeals
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	CR-25-60
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Chambers appealed a Drew County Circuit Court sentencing order convicting her, as an accomplice, of possession of more than two grams of methamphetamine with purpose to deliver and sentencing her to fifteen years' imprisonment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, considers only evidence supporting the verdict, and affirms if substantial evidence supports the conviction. Substantial evidence is evidence of sufficient force and character to compel a conclusion with reasonable certainty without speculation or conjecture. Witness credibility and conflicts in testimony are matters for the fact-finder.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Arkansas Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	Jasmine Leigh Chambers v. State of Arkansas

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- standard of review
- appellate procedure
- preservation of error
- sentencing

PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal law

Criminal procedure

Appellate procedure

Controlled-substances offenses

Accomplice liability

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether substantial evidence supported Chambers's conviction for possession of more than two grams of methamphetamine with purpose to deliver when the conviction was based on accomplice liability.
2. Whether the conviction could be sustained without proof that Chambers actually or constructively possessed the methamphetamine found on McWilliams and in the vehicle.

HOLDINGS

1. A contraband-possession conviction premised on accomplice liability can stand without proof of constructive possession by the defendant.
2. The conviction was affirmed because Chambers did not present an appellate argument controverting the accomplice liability found by the jury.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Contraband-possession convictions premised on accomplice liability can stand without proof of constructive possession.” (at 5)

“We will not research or develop arguments for a party, and a party’s failure to develop his or her own arguments precludes review of the issue on appeal.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Police arrested Jonathan McWilliams on outstanding warrants and found methamphetamine, other controlled substances, and drug paraphernalia on him and in the vehicle owned by Chambers. Officers also found methamphetamine in a contact-lens case in Chambers's purse, and testing established that the methamphetamine found in the vehicle and on McWilliams totaled more than two grams. An officer testified that the quantity and packaging of the drugs were consistent with distribution. Chambers denied knowing about the drugs and was convicted as McWilliams's accomplice of possessing methamphetamine with purpose to deliver.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found Chambers guilty as an accomplice and recommended a fifteen-year sentence. The Drew County Circuit Court entered a sentencing order consistent with the verdict and recommendation. Chambers appealed, challenging the sufficiency of the evidence, and the Arkansas Court of Appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Collins v. State, 2021 Ark. 35, at 4, 617 S.W.3d 701, 704
- Price v. State, 2019 Ark. 323, at 4, 588 S.W.3d 1, 4
- McKisick v. State, 2022 Ark. App. 426, at 4, 653 S.W.3d 839, 843
- Winters v. State, 2013 Ark. 193, at 12, 427 S.W.3d 597, 605
- B.T. v. State, 2019 Ark. App. 471, at 12, 588 S.W.3d 387, 394-95
- Lueken v. State, 88 Ark. App. 323, 331, 198 S.W.3d 547, 553 (2004)
- Criswell v. State, 2026 Ark. App. 6, at 5
- Smith v. Heather Manor Care Ctr., Inc., 2012 Ark. App. 584, at 7, 424 S.W.3d 368, 375

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Cite as 2026 Ark. App. 69 ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION III No. CR-25-60 JASMINE LEIGH CHAMBERS Opinion Delivered February 4, 2026 APPELLANT APPEAL FROM THE DREW COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT V. [NO. 22CR-23-54] STATE OF ARKANSAS HONORABLE ROBERT B. GIBSON III, APPELLEE JUDGE AFFIRMED WENDY SCHOLTENS WOOD, Judge Jasmine Chambers appeals the sentencing order entered by the Drew County Circuit Court convicting her, as an accomplice, of possession of methamphetamine with purpose to deliver and sentencing her to fifteen years' imprisonment.

Her sole point on appeal is that the evidence is insufficient to support her conviction. We affirm. The State presented testimony from three witnesses. The first witness, Officer David Menotti of the Monticello Police Department, said that on March 23, 2023, he responded to a call from Atwoods regarding a suspicious male in the store who was potentially shoplifting and a female who was "passed out" in the driver's seat of the suspect's car.

On investigation, Officer Menotti determined that the female, Chambers, was not passed out but asleep and that there were several active arrest warrants pending for the shoplifting suspect, Jonathan McWilliams. He said that when McWilliams left the store and got into the passenger seat of the car, he and Agent James Slaughter approached the car, asked McWilliams to step out, and arrested him on the outstanding warrants.

In connection with the arrest, they searched McWilliams and the car. In McWilliams's pocket, they discovered Ziploc bags containing several different controlled substances, an unlabeled bottle containing over four grams of methamphetamine, and a pipe.

After they searched McWilliams, Officer Menotti told Chambers that they were going to search the entire vehicle, which they learned was owned by Chambers, and asked her if there was anything illegal in the car or on her person. Chambers said, "There's nothing on me. I don't know

on the vehicle.” While conducting the search of the car, Officer Menotti found a contact-lens case in Chambers’s purse that contained approximately a half gram of methamphetamine.

All of this, from the arrest of McWilliams through the search of Chambers’s purse, was captured on Officer Menotti’s body camera, and the video was introduced into evidence and played for the jury. Agent Slaughter then testified that he worked with the Tenth Judicial District Drug Task Force and had certifications including “for methamphetamine training, advanced methamphetamine, undercover, [and] drug recognition expert” and that he had worked as an undercover officer about “a hundred times.” He said that he became involved in this case because he received information the night before the Atwoods incident that McWilliams was selling illegal narcotics to people at a local convenience store.

Agent Slaughter explained that they found a bottle containing methamphetamine in McWilliams’s pocket, a cigarette pack with a clear bag containing methamphetamine and a glass pipe containing residue in 2 the center console of the car, a contact-lens case containing methamphetamine in Chambers’s purse, a bag with two containers of marijuana in the trunk, and various bottles containing different types of pills.

Agent Slaughter testified that he had learned from his experience and training that a methamphetamine user might purchase between a half gram and a gram of methamphetamine, “which is way more than a useable amount” to use “a couple of times.” He said that the amount of methamphetamine found on McWilliams and in Chambers’s car is “a lot more than a usable amount for personal use” and is “very consistent with somebody selling it.” He also said that the fact that the pills are in a bottle different from the label on the bottle, as was found here, shows the pills were packaged for resale.

Quinton Bryant of the Arkansas State Crime Laboratory testified that the lab does not test all the evidence due to the tremendous backlog of their caseload; rather, the lab tests the items that would support the “highest charge” in the case.

Here, he tested the crystalline substance contained in the pill bottle found in McWilliams’s pocket and the crystalline substance found in one side of the contact-lens case. Both substances were methamphetamine: 4.6584 grams in the pill bottle and 0.3317 grams in the right side of the contact-lens case. He said that the same type of crystalline substance was found in the center console and weighed 1.3418 grams, and the crystalline substance in the other side of the contact-lens case weighed 0.1697 grams.

For the defense, Chambers testified on her own behalf. She said that she had been friends with McWilliams for a year and a half and had driven him in her car to Monticello 3 two days before the incident at Atwoods for a court appearance the day before. She could not remember the name of the hotel they stayed in but said they stayed in the same room. She said McWilliams wanted to

go to Atwoods to get a hat, so she took a nap in the car while she waited on him to shop, which she said took about an hour and a half or two hours.

She said that she had driven McWilliams to a dispensary the night before the incident to get marijuana but denied knowing how the methamphetamine, pills, or pipe got in her car or in her contact-lens case. Though she admitted in her direct testimony that the contact-lens case found in her purse was hers, on cross-examination Chambers said she was not sure if that case was hers because she had a few different ones, and her case usually contains solution and contacts.

The jury was instructed that Chambers was charged, as an accomplice, with possession of over two grams of methamphetamine with the purpose to deliver. The jury found her guilty and recommended a sentence of fifteen years' imprisonment.

The circuit court entered a sentencing order in accordance with the jury's verdict and sentence recommendation. Chambers filed this appeal challenging the sufficiency of the evidence supporting her conviction. When reviewing a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, we must assess the evidence in the light most favorable to the State and consider only the evidence that supports the verdict.

Collins v. State, 2021 Ark. 35, at 4, 617 S.W.3d 701, 704. We affirm a conviction if substantial evidence exists to support it. *Price v. State*, 2019 Ark. 323, at 4, 588 S.W.3d 1, 4. Substantial evidence is that which is of sufficient force and character that it will, with 4 reasonable certainty, compel a conclusion without resorting to speculation or conjecture.

Id., 588 S.W.3d at 4. Witness credibility is an issue for the fact-finder, which may believe all or part of any witness's testimony and may resolve questions of conflicting testimony and inconsistent evidence. *McKisick v. State*, 2022 Ark. App. 426, at 4, 653 S.W.3d 839, 843. Chambers was convicted of possession of more than two grams of methamphetamine with the purpose to deliver pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated section 5-64-420(b)(2) (Supp.

2023). The State's theory was that Chambers and McWilliams were accomplices of each other. A person is criminally liable for the conduct of another person when she or he is the accomplice of another person in the commission of an offense. Ark. Code Ann. § 5-2- 402(2) (Repl. 2024). A person is an accomplice of another person in the commission of an offense if, with the purpose of promoting or facilitating the commission of an offense, the person aids, agrees to aid, or attempts to aid the other person in planning or committing the offense.

Ark. Code Ann. § 5-2-403(a)(2) (Repl. 2024). Arkansas law makes no distinction between the criminal liability of a principal and an accomplice. *Winters v. State*, 2013 Ark. 193, at 12, 427 S.W.3d 597, 605. On appeal, Chambers argues that the evidence does not establish that she actually or constructively possessed the methamphetamine found on McWilliams and in her car.

She also argues that the evidence did not demonstrate that she had the purpose to deliver methamphetamine. She points to her testimony that she did not know what was in the car or in McWilliams's pocket or how the methamphetamine got into her contact-lens case. She bolsters this argument by stating that McWilliams did not provide any testimony tying her to the methamphetamine in his pocket.

She claims that the only thing that could possibly link her to the incident was the "very small amount of methamphetamine" found in a contact-lens case in her purse and that the only drugs and drug paraphernalia that "could possibly suggest purpose to deliver" were not found in her plain view. What Chambers does not argue, however, is that the evidence fails to prove that she was McWilliams's accomplice.

The State's case against Chambers was based on accomplice liability, and the jury was so instructed. The jury concluded that Chambers possessed methamphetamine with the intent to deliver on the basis of her status as an accomplice. Contraband-possession convictions premised on accomplice liability can stand without proof of constructive possession. See *B.T. v. State*, 2019 Ark.

App. 471, at 12, 588 S.W.3d 387, 394–95; *Lueken v. State*, 88 Ark. App. 323, 331, 198 S.W.3d 547, 553 (2004). A person is criminally liable for the conduct of another person when she or he is the accomplice of another person in the commission of an offense. Ark. Code Ann. § 5-2-402(2) (Repl. 2024).

We will not research or develop arguments for a party, and a party's failure to develop his or her own arguments precludes review of the issue on appeal. *Criswell v. State*, 2026 Ark. App. 6, at 5 (citing *Smith v. Heather Manor Care Ctr., Inc.*, 2012 Ark. App. 584, at 7, 424 S.W.3d 368, 375).

Accordingly, we affirm Chambers's conviction because she has not presented an argument on appeal controverting her accomplice liability as found by the jury. Affirmed. HIXSON and BROWN, JJ., agree. Vicki Lucas, for appellant. 6 Tim Griffin, Att'y Gen., by: A. Evangeline Bacon, Ass't Att'y Gen., for appellee. 7