OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

STATE OF MISSOURI,	)	ED108656
	)	
Respondent,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of the City of St. Louis
	)	1922-CR02121
v.	)	
	)	Honorable Clinton R. Wright
JAMEL JONES,	)	
	)	Filed: March 2, 2021
Appellant.	)	

Jamel Jones (Appellant) appeals from the trial court's judgment, after a jury trial, convicting him of eight counts of first-degree statutory sodomy, four counts of second-degree statutory sodomy, and two counts of first-degree child molestation. The trial court sentenced him as a persistent offender to consecutive 15-year sentences on three counts of first-degree statutory sodomy, three consecutive 10-year sentences on three other counts of first-degree statutory sodomy, concurrent 10-year sentences on the two counts of child molestation, and concurrent 15-year sentences for the remaining two counts of first-degree statutory sodomy and for the four counts of second-degree statutory sodomy, for a total sentence of 75 years of imprisonment.

AFFIRMED.

Division 2 holds: The State elected the particular criminal acts to support the charges against Appellant and the verdict directors specifically described the separate criminal acts presented to the jury as well as which victim was involved and the dates that corresponded to the time the family was living in the apartment location described. In applying *State v. Celis-Garcia*, 344 S.W.3d 150, 155-56 (Mo. banc 2011), to each of the contested verdict directors here, we find no multiple, distinct acts requiring more specificity than what the verdict directors already provided to insure jury unanimity. Point I is denied.

Appellant has not met his burden in showing prejudice such that a manifest injustice resulted from any alleged error in sentencing him as a persistent offender. Point II is denied.

Appellant's third point challenging the denial of his motions for acquittal raises no deficiency in the evidence as to any particular crime or element thereof to support reversal on the trial court's denial of his motion for judgment of acquittal. Point III is denied.

Opinion by: Lisa P. Page, J.

Robin Ransom, P.J. and Sherri B. Sullivan, J., concur.

Attorney for Appellant: David A. Bruns

Attorney for Respondent: Richard A. Starnes

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.