OPINION SUMMARY
MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

STATE OF MISSOURI, Respondent, v. ANTONIO STEED, Appellant.	)))))))))	ED113711 Filed: September 1, 2026

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis
The Honorable Joseph P. Whyte, Judge

SUMMARY:
Antonio Steed (Appellant) appeals from the trial court's judgment convicting him of first-degree robbery and armed criminal action following a jury trial.[1] The trial court respectively sentenced him to concurrent terms of fourteen and three years for robbery and armed criminal action.

AFFIRMED.

DIVISION TWO HOLDS: The trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting Fiancé's testimony, which spoke to material matters by identifying Victim and providing context for his encounter with Appellant and Codefendant. Appellant has not shown prejudice even if some parts of Fiancé's testimony did not "prove or disprove a disputed fact issue." *State v. Sprake*, 637 S.W.2d 724, 727 (Mo. App. W.D. 1982). Moreover, her testimony did not engender so much sympathy as to convict Appellant on the murder and accompanying armed criminal action count. Appellant's first point is denied.

Second, Appellant cannot claim on appeal the trial court abused its discretion or committed plain error in admitting the surveillance video over his objection. After the detective testified the video was fair and accurate, the defense did not challenge his testimony on cross examination and, in fact, elected to use the video for Appellant's own

[1] Appellant was charged with first-degree murder, first-degree robbery, and two counts of armed criminal action. The jury hung on the murder and accompanying armed criminal action counts and the trial court issued a mistrial as to those two counts. Appellant later pled guilty to voluntary manslaughter.

benefit. Appellant authenticated it himself as an actual witness familiar with the subject matter of the video and may not complain now of prejudice created by his own conduct. *State v. Copeland*, 95 S.W.3d 196, 202 (Mo. App. S.D. 2003) (citations omitted). His second point on appeal is denied.

Finally, the evidence at trial was sufficient to show Appellant conspired with Codefendant to commit a robbery against Victim, who was found deceased with several gunshot wounds and stripped down to his underwear and socks on the front walkway of a vacant residence. He no longer had the $400 cash he won playing blackjack or the backpack he had carried. As a result, a reasonable jury could find Appellant guilty of first-degree robbery and the accompanying armed criminal action. Appellant's third point is denied.

Opinion by: Lisa P. Page, Presiding Judge

Rebeca Navarro-McKelvey, Judge and Kathleen S. Hamilton, Judge, concur.

Attorney for Appellant: Matthew W. Vineyard

Attorney for Respondent: Karen L. Kramer

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.