MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

LARRY D. RATLIFF, Appellant,
v.
STATE OF MISSOURI, Respondent.

DOCKET NUMBER WD87922

DATE: JULY 28, 2026

Appeal From:

Clay County Circuit Court
The Honorable Shane Terril Alexander, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division One: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge, Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge, and Thomas N. Chapman, Judge

---

Attorneys:

JoEllen Grohs, Kansas City, MO, for appellant.

Dora Fishter, Jefferson City, MO, for respondent.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

LARRY D. RATLIFF, Appellant,
v.
STATE OF MISSOURI, Respondent.

WD87922 Clay County

Before Division One Judges: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge, Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge, and Thomas N. Chapman, Judge

Larry D. Ratliff appeals the judgment of the Circuit Court of Clay County, Missouri, denying, after an evidentiary hearing, Ratliff's amended motion for post-conviction relief pursuant to Rule 29.15. Ratliff was convicted of murder in the first degree and armed criminal action for the killing of his estranged wife. On appeal, Ratliff claims the motion court clearly erred in denying his amended post-conviction motion because Ratliff's trial counsel was constitutionally ineffective by failing to request that the trial court submit MAI-CR section 410.06, regarding the voluntariness of his confession.

AFFIRMED.

Division One holds:

MAI-CR 410.06 requires the jury to disregard a confession *if* the jury fails to find: 1) the defendant made the statement; 2) the defendant understood what he was saying and doing at the time he made the statement; and 3) the statement was freely and voluntarily given under all the circumstances. Ratliff does not dispute that he made the statement, that he voluntarily asked to meet with detectives prior to making the statement, and that he signed a written waiver of his Miranda rights. Further, the motion court found that the evidence presented at trial overwhelmingly showed that Ratliff knew what he was saying and doing when he made the statement. His statement was long, detailed, and repeated the events of January 4, 2016, at least twice; and Ratliff offered no evidence that he was suffering from any mental disease at the time he gave his statement or that the statement was involuntary. Further, as to the elements of the offenses, Ratliff's trial testimony was very consistent with his confession to the detectives. Thus, we agree with the motion court that even if the jury had received the proposed instruction, the jury's verdict would not have changed.

Opinion by: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge July 28, 2026

This summary is UNOFFICIAL and should not be quoted or cited.