

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO.	C-250626
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO.	25/CRB/13517
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY</i>	
JAQUAN DEWS,	:		
Defendant-Appellant.	:		

**MOORE, Judge.**

This court sua sponte removes this cause from the regular calendar and places it on the court’s accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); Loc.R. 11.1.

Defendant-appellant Jaquan Dews appeals from the Hamilton County Municipal Court’s judgment after he was convicted of menacing following a bench trial. At trial, the complaining witness testified that Dews stood outside of her apartment’s open window and threatened to beat her, and that these threats made her fearful. On appeal, Dews argues that his conviction was not supported by sufficient evidence and was contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence.

*Sufficiency and Manifest Weight*

A sufficiency challenge tasks that we review “whether the evidence presented, when viewed in a light most favorable to the prosecution, would allow any rational trier of fact to find the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.” *State v. Dunn*, 2024-Ohio-5742, ¶ 28, quoting *State v. Dent*, 2020-Ohio-6670, ¶ 15.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

A manifest-weight challenge requires we “weigh the evidence and all reasonable inferences, consider the credibility of witnesses and determine whether in resolving conflicts in the evidence, the [trier of fact] clearly lost its way.” (Cleaned up.) *State v. Martin*, 2022-Ohio-4175, ¶ 26, citing *State v. Thompkins*, 78 Ohio St.3d 380, 387 (1997). “When conflicting evidence is presented at trial, a conviction is not against the manifest weight of the evidence simply because the fact finder believed the prosecution’s testimony evidence.” *State v. Henry*, 2025-Ohio-5333, ¶ 22 (1st Dist.), citing *State v. McDaniel*, 2021-Ohio-724, ¶ 25 (1st Dist.).

To convict a defendant of menacing, the State must show that the victim believed that they were at risk of physical harm to themselves or their property. *State v. Kmosko*, 2025-Ohio-2433, ¶ 39 (4th Dist.), quoting *State v. Szafranski*, 2025-Ohio-1104, ¶ 50 (6th Dist.).

Dews’s sufficiency challenge is meritless. The complaining witness’s testimony reflects that Dews’s threats caused her to believe that she was at risk of harm. The complaining witness believed that the threats were credible because she lived on the first floor, and Dews could have raised her window screen and entered her apartment. Based on this testimony, a rational trier of fact could believe that the State proved each element of the offense of menacing beyond a reasonable doubt.

Dews’s manifest-weight challenge also fails. Dews contends that he did not threaten the complaining witness, but that he was speaking loudly outside of the complaining witness’s home so that his son would hear his voice and want to come outside. The trial court was in the best position to weigh Dews’s and the complaining witness’s testimony and was well situated to conclude that the complaining witness’s testimony was the more credible of the two. Therefore, we cannot say that the court clearly lost its way in convicting Dews of menacing.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---


Therefore, Dews's sole assignment of error is overruled, and we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

The court further orders that (1) a copy of this Judgment constitutes the mandate, (2) the mandate be sent to the trial court for execution under App.R. 27, and (3) costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

**ZAYAS, P.J.**, and **CROUSE, J.**, concur.

**To the clerk:**

**Enter upon the journal of the court on 6/12/2026 per order of the court.**

By:  \_\_\_\_\_  
**Administrative Judge**