

STATE OF MAINE

v.

JUSTIN T. CHIPMAN

Submitted on Briefs November 4, 2020  
Decided November 12, 2020

Panel: MEAD, JABAR, HUMPHREY, HORTON, and CONNORS, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Justin T. Chipman appeals from a judgment of conviction of burglary (Class B), 17-A M.R.S. § 401(1)(B)(4) (2020); theft by unauthorized taking (Class E), 17-A M.R.S. § 353(1)(A) (2020); unauthorized use of property (Class D), 17-A M.R.S. § 360(1)(A) (2020); criminal mischief (Class D), 17-A M.R.S. § 806(1)(A) (2020); and aggravated cruelty to animals (Class C), 17 M.R.S. § 1031(1-B) (2017),<sup>1</sup> entered by the trial court (Hancock County, *R. Murray, J.*) after a jury-waived trial. Contrary to Chipman’s sole contention on appeal, the trial record contains sufficient evidence to support the court’s finding, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Chipman is the person who committed the crimes. *See State v. Black*, 2000 ME 211, ¶ 14, 763 A.2d 109 (“We will overturn the [trial court’s] judgment only if no trier of fact rationally could have found the essential elements of the charged offense beyond a reasonable doubt.” (quotation marks omitted)); *see also State v. Hansley*, 2019 ME 35, ¶ 19, 203 A.3d 827 (“We defer to all . . . reasonable inferences drawn by the

---

<sup>1</sup> In ways not relevant to the issues in this appeal, 17 M.R.S. § 1031(1-B) has since been amended. *See* P.L. 2019, ch. 113, § C-55 (emergency, effective May 16, 2019) (codified at 17 M.R.S. § 1031(1-B) (2020)).

fact-finder, even if those inferences are contradicted by parts of the direct evidence.” (quotation marks omitted)); *State v. Haji-Hassan*, 2018 ME 42, ¶ 27, 182 A.3d 145; *State v. Belhumeur*, 2015 ME 150, ¶ 6, 128 A.3d 646.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Robert Van Horn, Esq., Van Horn Law Office, Ellsworth, for appellant Justin T. Chipman

Toff Toffolon, Deputy District Attorney, Ellsworth, for appellee State of Maine