

SUPREME COURT OF NORTH DAKOTA

State v. Eggleston

Eggleston, 2026 ND 41 (N.D. 2026) · No. No. 20250291 · Decided February 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The North Dakota Supreme Court affirmed Alex Kenny Eggleston’s conviction for simple assault on a correctional officer. The court held that Eggleston waived his challenge to the jury instructions by stating he had no objections and concluded that sufficient evidence supported the conviction.

OPINION

State v. Eggleston 2026 ND 41

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

2026 ND 41 State of North Dakota, Plaintiff and Appellee v. Alex Kenny Eggleston, Defendant and Appellant No. 20250291 Appeal from the District Court of Burleigh County, South Central Judicial District, the Honorable James S. Hill, Judge. AFFIRMED. Per Curiam. Gabrielle J. Goter, Senior Assistant State’s Attorney, and Shaun H. Peterson, Assistant State’s Attorney, Bismarck, N.D., for plaintiff and appellee; on brief. Kiara C. Kraus-Parr, Grand Forks, N.D., for defendant and appellant; on brief. State v. Eggleston No. 20250291 Per Curiam. [¶1] Alex Kenny Eggleston appeals from a criminal judgment entered after a jury found him guilty of simple assault on a correctional officer under N.D.C.C. § 12.1-17-01(1)(a). He argues the district court committed obvious error by failing to instruct the jury that it must unanimously agree on the specific act that caused bodily injury to the victim. He also argues the prosecution presented insufficient evidence to support his conviction. [¶2] At trial, after closing arguments but before the instructions were given to the jury, the district court asked defense counsel whether he had any objections: THE COURT: And Mr. Kelsch . . . any objections or exceptions to the closing instructions? MR. KELSCH: No, Your Honor. Eggleston waived his claim of error in the jury instructions. State v. Vervalen, 2024 ND 124, ¶ 8, 8 N.W.3d 816. Obvious error review does not apply to waived errors. Id. “A defendant challenging the sufficiency of the evidence on appeal must show that the evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to the verdict, reveals no reasonable inference of guilt.” State v. Mohammed, 2020 ND 52, ¶ 5, 939 N.W.2d 498. We conclude from our review of the record that there was sufficient evidence to support the guilty verdict. We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(3) and (7). [¶3] Lisa Fair McEvers, C.J. Jerod E. Tufte Jon J. Jensen Douglas A. Bahr Donovan J. Foughty, S.J. [¶4] The Honorable Donovan J. Foughty, Surrogate Judge, sitting in place of Crothers, J., disqualified. 1

