

STATE OF MAINE

v.

CRAIG DAUKSIS

Submitted on Briefs October 31, 2002
Decided November 15, 2002

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and CLIFFORD, RUDMAN, DANA, ALEXANDER,
CALKINS, and LEVY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Craig Dauksis appeals from the judgments of the Superior Court (Kennebec County, *Jabar, J.*) entered on a jury verdict convicting him of robbery (Class A) in violation of 17-A M.R.S.A. § 651(1)(D) (1983 & Supp. 2001) and assault (Class D) in violation of 17-A M.R.S.A. § 207(1) (1983 & Supp. 2001). Dauksis argues that (1) there was not sufficient evidence to identify him as the individual who committed the robbery or to prove that he was an accomplice to the robbery, and (2) the Superior Court erred when it instructed the jury regarding the reasonably

foreseeable consequence basis for accomplice liability. 17-A M.R.S.A. § 57(3)(A) (1983).

The record demonstrates that the evidence was sufficient to convict Dauksis of robbery as a principal or as an accomplice. *See State v. Rankin*, 666 A.2d 123, 124-26 (Me. 1995); *see also State v. Pheng*, 2002 ME 40, ¶¶ 9-10, 791 A.2d 925, 927-98; *State v. Jurek*, 594 A.2d 553, 555 (Me. 1991). The questioned jury instruction, which was agreed to at trial, must be reviewed for obvious error. *State v. Berry*, 1998 ME 113, ¶ 10, 711 A.2d 142, 145. No obvious error is demonstrated in the context of this case. *See id.* at ¶¶ 10-12, 711 A.2d 145-46; *State v. Daniels*, 663 A.2d 33, 36 (Me. 1995).

The entry is:

Judgments affirmed.

Attorneys for State:

David Crook, District Attorney
Alan Kelley, Deputy Dist. Atty.
95 State Street
Augusta, ME 04330

Attorney for defendant:

Sumner H. Lipman, Esq.
Gregg D. Bernstein, Esq.
Lipman, Katz & McKee, P.A.
P O Box 1051
Augusta, ME 04332-1051