

STATE OF MAINE

v.

WILLIAM F. BEDARD

Submitted on Briefs April 21, 2016
Decided April 28, 2016

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, MEAD, GORMAN, HJELM, and HUMPHREY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

William F. Bedard appeals from a judgment of conviction for terrorizing (Class D), 17-A M.R.S. § 210(1)(A) (2015), entered by the trial court (York County, *O’Neil, J.*) after a jury trial. Contrary to Bedard’s contentions, there was sufficient evidence for the jury to find Bedard guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of each element of the crime. *See* 17-A M.R.S. § 210(1)(A); *State v. Williams*, 2012 ME 63, ¶ 49, 52 A.3d 911 (“[T]he fact-finder is free to selectively accept or reject testimony presented based on the credibility of the witness or the internal cogency of the content.” (quotation marks omitted)).

Further, contrary to Bedard’s contentions, there was no obvious error when the State argued in its rebuttal closing that the jury should convict Bedard if it believed the victim-witness and acquit him if it did not believe her, where the State “correctly stated the reasonable doubt standard elsewhere in [its] argument” and the court “fully and adequately instructed the jury on the duty of the State to prove each element of [the crime] beyond a reasonable doubt as well as on the proper role of witness credibility in this case.” *State v. Hinds*, 485 A.2d 231, 238 (Me. 1984). Here, as in *Hinds*, “[t]he remarks seized upon by the defendant were

merely a comment upon the indisputable fact that the credibility of the complainant was a crucial issue in this case.” *Id.*

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs:

Scott M. Houde, Esq., Law Offices of Scott M. Houde,
Biddeford, for appellant William F. Bedard

Kathryn Loftus Slattery, District Attorney, and Anne Marie
Pazar, Asst. Dist. Atty., Prosecutorial District #1, Alfred, for
appellee State of Maine