

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO

TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State of Ohio,	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
v.	:	No. 17AP-613 (C.P.C. No. 16CR-4350)
Chavez D. Caslin,	:	(REGULAR CALENDAR)
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

D E C I S I O N

Rendered on December 31, 2018

On brief: *Ron O'Brien*, Prosecuting Attorney, and *Steven L. Taylor*, for appellee.

On brief: *W. Joseph Edwards*, for appellant.

APPEAL from the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas

BRUNNER, J.

{¶ 1} Defendant-appellant, Chavez D. Caslin, appeals from a judgment of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas entered on July 27, 2017, sentencing Caslin to serve 25 years in prison based on jury verdicts finding Caslin guilty of aggravated burglary, kidnapping, aggravated robbery, rape, gross sexual imposition, and tampering with evidence. We find the trial court properly admitted a Facebook screen shot when the analyst who took the screen shot appeared and testified about how she obtained it, and the overall body of evidence against Caslin was sufficient and not manifestly against conviction. We therefore overrule all of Caslin's assignments of error and affirm.

I. FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

{¶ 2} On August 11, 2016, a Franklin County Grand Jury indicted Caslin for one count of aggravated burglary, two counts of kidnapping, two counts of aggravated robbery, four counts of rape, one count of gross sexual imposition, and one count of tampering with

evidence. (Aug. 11, 2016 Indictment at 1-6.) All the charges were accompanied by firearm specifications. *Id.* The charges stemmed from a home invasion Caslin perpetrated with three other teenage friends in which they robbed a young couple, held them hostage in their own home, terrorized them both, and raped the female victim (whom we shall, for privacy reasons, refer to as S.R.). At the trial, ten witnesses testified against Caslin.

{¶ 3} S.R. testified that, in April 2015, she was living in an apartment in Groveport, Ohio, with her fiancé, G.E., and was then in her mid 20s. (Tr. at 169.)¹ She said she was on her way back to her apartment sometime before 5 a.m. having just started her car to warm it up before leaving for work, when someone ran around the corner of the building, put a gun to her head, and pushed her inside her own apartment. (Tr. at 173-74.) She yelled for her fiancé as the assailant pushed her to the ground. (Tr. at 174-75.) When her fiancé responded, the attacker and three others, all identified as being "black," punched G.E., knocking him down and forcing him to lie beside her. (Tr. at 177.) According to S.R.'s testimony, the invaders then ordered her to strip, to lie on the floor, and to "stick my fingers in my vagina." (Tr. at 179-80.) She did as they ordered, and at their direction, she avoided looking at them, mostly keeping her eyes closed. *Id.* While this was going on, she was groped sexually by an unknown number of persons. (Tr. at 179-81.)

{¶ 4} After some time, the perpetrators told her to go upstairs and physically guided her upstairs. (Tr. at 182.) As she was made to walk upstairs, she peeked and saw they had made G.E. remove his clothing also. (Tr. at 183-84.) Upstairs they placed her on her bed and one assailant raped her vaginally while another forced her to fellate him. (Tr. at 184-86, 189.) As they did, they made her say she "love[d] this squad dick." (Tr. at 185-86, 189.) At one point, she realized some of the rapists were filming the rape with camera phones. (Tr. at 203-04.) Though she could not tell whether the rapists ejaculated, after a time, the rape stopped and the rapists made her wash herself off in the bathroom. (Tr. at 190-91.) Then they tied her up, and dumped nail polish on her including into her vagina. (Tr. at 191-93.) Finally they left, telling her to count to 160. (Tr. at 193-94.) G.E. and S.R. escaped their bonds, G.E. found their landlord, and asked her to call the police. (Tr. at 197-99.) After it was all over, the couple discovered they had been robbed of several cell phones,

¹ The transcript of the trial and sentencing in this case was filed on March 26 and April 4, 2018 in four volumes with consecutively numbered pages as a whole. For citation simplicity, we cite only to the page number.

two tablets, a .22 rifle, an Xbox One, a Blu-Ray player, a Nikon camera, a number of decorative swords and knives, G.E.'s wallet, and miscellaneous change. (Tr. at 196-98.)

{¶ 5} G.E.'s account of events was similar. G.E. agreed that on April 30, 2015, he was living in a townhome apartment at 3968 Grand Bend Drive in Groveport with S.R. (Tr. at 206-07.) He was upstairs when he heard her cry out his name. (Tr. at 209-10.) He ran downstairs to see what the matter was and was met with a fist to the face as he reached the bottom of the stairs and turned the corner. *Id.* He testified he couldn't see who hit him but there were four guys, identified as being "black," and wearing hoodies. *Id.* As he lay on the floor, the guys ordered S.R. to take off her clothes. (Tr. at 211-12.) While the others were occupied with her, one of the invaders told him to strip and began to interrogate him about where their valuables were, kicking him in the face whenever the assailant believed G.E. to be lying. (Tr. at 213-15, 218-19.) G.E. testified that at one point, he observed the other perpetrators groping S.R. who was, at that point, fully naked. (Tr. at 217.)

{¶ 6} G.E. said one individual held him downstairs while the others were upstairs with S.R. (Tr. at 219.) After a time, the individual holding G.E. got thirsty, helped himself to a soda from the refrigerator, and offered one to the guys upstairs. (Tr. at 219-20.) When that robber went upstairs, G.E. tried to escape, but before he could get the door open, a guy came downstairs, put a pillow over his head, socked a gun up against it, and asked him if he really wanted to die today. (Tr. at 221-22.) The individual then told G.E. that the others were raping S.R. upstairs and asked him how that made him feel. *Id.* Later, someone took him upstairs to tie him up and he saw S.R. naked, being violated from both ends by two different perpetrators. (Tr. at 223-24.) As they raped her, he heard one of them comment to the effect of "[y]ou like this black dick, don't you?" (Tr. at 232.)

{¶ 7} As he was being bound with electrical cord, he heard the rapists take S.R. into the bathroom and tell her to clean her vagina, saying, "[w]ash it good. You don't want me to do it for you." (Tr. at 225.) Then G.E. said they poured nail polish on S.R. (Tr. at 227.) As they poured it into her vagina she complained about it burning her and one of the invaders said that such was the intent. *Id.* When the perpetrators finally left, they told G.E. to count to 160, which he did before running to the landlord's office to ask for help in notifying the police. (Tr. at 227-29.) In all, he testified the robbers stole cellular phones,

his .22 rifle, a nice camera, his Xbox One, a collection of knives, and his wallet. (Tr. at 230-31.)

{¶ 8} A number of witnesses offered short testimony to confirm G.E. and S.R.'s recounting. The first-responding patrol officer testified the victims related substantially the same version of events. (Tr. at 37-47.) He additionally remarked both victims seemed shaken and upset, and G.E. had facial redness consistent with having been involved in an altercation. (Tr. at 40.) G.E. and S.R.'s landlord testified she was preparing to walk her dog at about 6:30 in the morning on April 30, 2015 when G.E. knocked at the door seeking help. (Tr. at 345-46.) She testified G.E. asked her to call the police because he had been beaten up and S.R. had been raped. *Id.* S.R. also told her she had been raped, and the rapists had poured nail polish on her. (Tr. at 347-49.) A nurse from a local hospital testified she examined S.R. (Tr. at 129.) She said she observed abrasions and tiny tears to parts of S.R.'s vagina and also observed nail polish in her vagina. (Tr. at 142-44.)

{¶ 9} Neither S.R. nor G.E. was able to affirmatively identify the men who invaded their home that morning. (Tr. at 200, 202, 236-37.) But a Columbus police detective testified about how the investigation found the individuals who were accused of committing these crimes. The detective testified that when he arrived at the scene on April 30, G.E. looked bloodied as if he had been beaten, and S.R. was shaking and crying. (Tr. at 451-58.) Based on G.E.'s recounting of events, the detective and his team collected a soda can from the scene and also notified the Columbus police property recovery unit of the identifying information for S.R. and G.E.'s telephones. (Tr. at 455-59.) The property recovery unit was contacted on May 1, 2015 when a person named Chaz Brantford sold G.E.'s phone, and again on May 3, 2015 when a female named Briana Booker sold S.R.'s phone. (Tr. at 460-62; State's Exs. U1-U2.) The investigators received another break when, on May 8, 2015, two young gang members named Elijah Hand and Lawson Harris were arrested fleeing the scene of a robbery-murder where Harris had used G.E.'s .22 rifle to fatally shoot their victim. (Tr. at 385, 403, 474-76, 511.) With the help of a data analyst, the police began to investigate social media for connections to identify other potential perpetrators. (Tr. at 464.) Through this process, they identified Chaz Brantford as the brother of Lawson Harris and identified Briana Booker as Caslin's girlfriend. (Tr. at 464-65.) In addition, DNA from the soda can facilitated the investigative team identifying an individual named Deandre

Wallace. (Tr. at 466-67.) DNA consistent with Harris was discovered on S.R.'s face and Wallace's DNA was discovered in S.R.'s vagina and on her lower back. (Tr. at 534, 538, 545; State's Ex. P at 2-4.) When confronted with the evidence against them, Lawson Harris and Deandre Wallace agreed to tell what they knew about the April 30, 2015 home invasion robbery and rape. (Tr. at 296, 469, 474-76; State's Exs. R1-S1.)

{¶ 10} Wallace, who had raped S.R. and was facing potentially over 100 years in prison, agreed to cooperate with the State so that the prosecutor would recommend that he only serve 20 years. (State's Ex. R1.) Hand, who had orally raped S.R. and was a participant in a separate aggravated robbery that resulted in a murder, agreed to cooperate with the State so that the prosecutor would recommend that he serve just 13 years in prison. (State's Ex. S1.) Both individuals agreed to testify against their fellow perpetrators according to written agreements with the State. (State's Exs. R1-S1.)

{¶ 11} Wallace testified Caslin (whom he knew as "Vez" or "Vezzo"), Hand (who went by the nickname "Gunner"), and Harris (who went by "Lawson") were all part of the East Haven Bloods and were hanging out in the early morning of April 30, 2015, talking about how to make some money. (Tr. at 248-51, 256-57, 269-70.) The young gang members decided that a good way to make some easy money would be to rob someone. (Tr. at 251.) So they wandered through a wooded area near apartments scouting for a victim when they saw S.R. go to her truck and then start to return to her apartment. (Tr. at 251-52.) The four followed her and forced their way in. *Id.* Harris punched G.E. in the face to subdue him and Caslin held a gun on G.E. and S.R. (Tr. at 253-54.) Wallace said that once S.R. was naked (he was not clear about how or why S.R. became naked), the perpetrators started touching her, forcing her to play with herself, and that Caslin inserted the gun in her vagina. (Tr. at 254-55.) He said they teased her, making cracks about how much she liked it, making her say she loved his "squad winky." (Tr. at 256.) Wallace explained he did not know exactly what was meant by "squad" but it was a gang thing that he and his friends always said. *Id.* After a time, he took her upstairs and raped her vaginally until he ejaculated while Hand grabbed her by the hair and forced his penis into her mouth. (Tr. at 257-58, 265-66.) Wallace said Lawson recorded the rape but Caslin deleted the recording. (Tr. at 259-60.) He also said Caslin watched the rape and held a gun at his side as he did. *Id.*

{¶ 12} Wallace related that after the rape, he and Harris forced S.R. to wash her vagina and Harris poured nail polish in her vagina and all over her body. (Tr. at 261-62.) According to Wallace, Caslin was the one who tied up the victims with phone cords. (Tr. at 265.) Then the three went downstairs to finish robbing the apartment and took tablets, phones, knives, swords, and a rifle. (Tr. at 262-63.) Wallace testified he was afraid of being recognized as a "snitch" and Caslin had threatened him, telling him to remain silent. (Tr. at 268-69, 295-97.) But Wallace testified he was facing well over 100 years in prison, was in significant trouble due the presence of his DNA at the scene, and wanted to help himself by obtaining a sentence of 20 years instead. (Tr. at 280-89.)

{¶ 13} Hand also testified. He admitted that although he was 16 years old at the time of the offenses, he was involved in a string of serious offenses including multiple home invasions and a homicide. (Tr. at 353-55.) Like Wallace, he recounted he was hanging out with Harris, Wallace, and Caslin (whom he knew as "Vez") and they all decided to commit a robbery. (Tr. at 363-66.) They saw S.R. getting ready to go to work and when she reentered the house, they went in after her. (Tr. at 367-68.) Caslin had a gun and was pointing it at the victims while Harris was the one who punched G.E. in the face. (Tr. at 368.) Caslin and Harris were the ones who ordered the victims to strip. (Tr. at 370.) Once S.R. was nude, they ordered her to dance provocatively while Harris took charge of G.E. (Tr. at 370-73.) As Wallace raped S.R. vaginally, Hand forced her to perform fellatio. (Tr. at 377-80.) Caslin recorded the rape and made demands on S.R. such as requiring her to say she "love[d] squad dick." (Tr. at 377-79.) Hand also said "squad" did not really mean anything except that someone was part of the East Haven gang. (Tr. at 379.) When the rape ended, Caslin made S.R. clean herself while Harris dumped nail polish on her. (Tr. at 381-82.) Hand was not sure who tied up G.E. but said Harris tied up S.R. (Tr. at 383.) Before leaving, they told the victims to count to 100, then stole a .22 rifle, an Xbox, swords, change, phones, and some tablets. (Tr. at 384-86.)

{¶ 14} Hand and Wallace both admitted they had previously lied about their involvement in the rape and robbery. (Tr. at 307-10, 388-89.) Both were also confronted and cross-examined regarding various inconsistencies between their stories, the recounting told by the victims, and the physical evidence. (Tr. at 261, 289-90, 399, 411-13.) For example, if Wallace's version of events were taken at face value, S.R. was already naked

when they followed her in to the apartment and if Hand's version were taken at face value, S.R. was not touched at all in the kitchen or downstairs area of the house. (Tr. at 272, 399.) There was also confusion about who was where during the robbery and who recorded the rape. (Tr. at 401.) Hand even admitted obscuring the truth is his first instinct. (Tr. at 388.)

{¶ 15} During trial, an evidentiary dispute occurred regarding one of the State's exhibits used to connect Caslin to the crime. Specifically, the defense challenged the admission of a Facebook post from April 17, 2015, in which someone whose profile name is "Vezzo Bandmann Ots" posted nine photos of Caslin and someone who closely resembled Booker and is referred to in the post as "Briiana Booker." (State's Ex. T; Tr. 315-19, 430-35.) Along with the photos posted on Vezzo's account was the following description:

Man I love this woman Briiana Booker! Babe been here with me through the good and the bad and never once changed up....she keep it all the way %100. she trustworthy, down for what ever when it's time ride for her nigga no question....Ain't to many bitches like her I love her and everything about her!

(Sic passim.)(State's Ex. T.) In response to this declaration, a response was posted from "Briiana Booker" consisting of a number of enthusiastic emoticons and the words, "I Love You To [sic] Papi." *Id.* Among the nine photos was an image of a tattoo of hearts with the name, "Chavez" in script. *Id.* Also included was a picture of Caslin flipping the camera the bird while hugging Booker. *Id.* Across his knuckles in gothic-style script is the text, "SQAD."² *Id.* Following testimony from an analyst with the Columbus Division of Police that she took the screenshot of the social media page for "Vezzo Bandmann Ots" to create State's exhibit T, the trial court admitted the exhibit over a defense objection on the grounds of authenticity. (Tr. at 315-19, 430-31, 439-43, 564-65.)

{¶ 16} On June 19, 2017, the jury announced a verdict of guilty on all counts and specifications except for one of the rape counts for vaginal penetration and associated firearm specification. (June 19, 2017 Verdict Forms; Tr. at 674-80.) On July 26, 2017, the trial court sentenced Caslin to serve 25 years in prison. (Tr. at 703-04; July 27, 2017 Jgmt. Entry at 2.)

{¶ 17} Caslin now appeals.

² In the picture it appears approximately thus, "SQAD," but (given the hand position) upside down and backwards.

II. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

{¶ 18} Caslin assigns four errors for our review:

[1.] THE TRIAL COURT ERRED WHEN IT ENTERED JUDGMENT AGAINST THE APPELLANT WHEN THE EVIDENCE WAS INSUFFICIENT TO SUSTAIN A CONVICTION

[2.] THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN OVERRULING APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL PURSUANT TO CRIMINAL RULE 29

[3.] THE TRIAL COURT ERRED WHEN IT ENTERED A JUDGMENT AGAINST THE APPELLANT WHEN THE CONVICTION WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE MANIFEST WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE

[4.] THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING THE STATE TO USE AN UNAUTHENTICATED PHOTOGRAPH FROM A SOCIAL MEDIA USER WHO IS NEITHER A WITNESS NOR A PARTY TO THIS CASE, IN VIOLATION OF THE OHIO RULES OF EVIDENCE THEREBY DEPRIVING APPELLANT OF HIS SUBSTANTIAL AND PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS

For clarity, we address the fourth assignment of error first and address the first, second, and third assignments of error together.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Fourth Assignment of Error – Whether the Trial Court Erred in Admitting the Screenshot of the Facebook Page of "Vezzo Bandmann Ots" in which Caslin is Repeatedly Pictured with Booker.

{¶ 19} Evid.R. 901(A) provides that a "condition precedent to admissibility" is authentication through "evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims." Caslin argues in his brief the screenshot was never properly authenticated because anyone can create a fictitious account and masquerade as another person on social media, and someone with knowledge of the account-holder's identity was not called to testify. (Caslin Brief at 23-24.) Caslin's argument is inadequate to support error because it misapprehends the rule by presuming no one but the social media account creator could adequately authenticate a screenshot from the account.

{¶ 20} Evid.R. 901(B)(1) specifies the authentication requirement can be satisfied by the "[t]estimony of [a] witness with knowledge" that "a matter is what it is claimed to be." In this case, a criminal intelligence analyst from the Columbus Division of Police testified she found the Facebook page on a public Facebook profile, she took a screenshot, and exhibit T was a true and accurate copy of that screenshot. (Tr. at 439-42.) She described its contents and noted the references to "Briiana Booker" by "Vezzo" and noted "Briiana Booker's" reply. (Tr. at 439-42.) She also drew attention to the fact that the pictures of "Vezzo" appear to be pictures of Caslin, and the pictures of "Briiana" on the Facebook page appear to be pictures of the same person photographed by surveillance cameras when Booker sold S.R.'s phone. *Id.* In the absence of evidence or contemporaneous objections that would support an inference that the screenshot photographs were contrived or altered, we find the evidence presented to have been both admissible and sufficient testimony in this case since the witness had knowledge the screenshot of the Facebook page was what it purported to be and could state what it communicated.

{¶ 21} We previously have addressed the foundation needed for admissibility of Facebook posts:

Evid.R. 901 states that all evidence must be properly authenticated before it is admissible into evidence. Exhibits are properly authenticated when there is evidence "sufficient to support finding that the matter in question is what the proponent claims." Evid.R. 901(A). Authenticity can be demonstrated by extrinsic evidence or the evidence can be self-authenticating. Authentication is satisfied when a proponent presents foundational evidence or testimony from which a rational jury may determine that the evidence is what its proponent claims it to be. *State v. Farrah*, 10th Dist. No. 01AP-968, 2002-Ohio-1918, ¶ 39. "The proponent need not offer conclusive evidence as a foundation must merely offer sufficient evidence to allow the question as to authenticity or genuineness to reach the jury." *State v. Caldwell*, 9th Dist. No. 14720, 1991 Ohio App. LEXIS 5879 (Dec. 4, 1991).

State v. Callender, 10th Dist. No. 15AP-15, 2015-Ohio-4255, ¶ 32; *see also State v. Ross*, 10th Dist. No. 17AP-141, 2018-Ohio-3027, ¶ 37-38. "Generally, '[t]he admission of evidence is within the discretion of the trial court.'" *Shaw v. Underwood*, 10th Dist. No. 16AP-605, 2017-Ohio-845, ¶ 25, quoting *Brown v. Dept. of Rehab. & Corr.*, 10th Dist. No. 13AP-804, 2014-Ohio-1810, ¶ 36, citing *Banford v. Aldrich Chem. Co.*, 126 Ohio St.3d 210, 2010-Ohio-

2470, ¶ 38; *see also, e.g., JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Liggins*, 10th Dist. No. 15AP-242, 2016-Ohio-3528, ¶ 18.

{¶ 22} State's Exhibit T was sufficiently authenticated and the trial court did not err in refusing to exclude it. Caslin's fourth assignment of error is overruled.

B. First, Second, and Third Assignments of Error – Whether Caslin's Convictions were Insufficiently Supported or Contrary to the Manifest Weight of the Evidence

{¶ 23} In his first assignment of error, Caslin alleges his convictions were not supported by sufficient evidence. Sufficiency is:

"[A] term of art meaning that legal standard which is applied to determine whether the case may go to the jury or whether the evidence is legally sufficient to support the jury verdict as a matter of law." * * * In essence, sufficiency is a test of adequacy. Whether the evidence is legally sufficient to sustain a verdict is a question of law.

Eastley v. Volkman, 132 Ohio St.3d 328, 2012-Ohio-2179, ¶ 11, quoting *State v. Thompkins*, 78 Ohio St.3d 380, 386 (1997); *Black's Law Dictionary* 1433 (6th Ed.1990). "In reviewing a record for sufficiency, '[t]he relevant inquiry is whether, after viewing the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime proven beyond a reasonable doubt.'" *State v. Monroe*, 105 Ohio St.3d 384, 2005-Ohio-2282, ¶ 47, quoting *State v. Jenks*, 61 Ohio St.3d 259 (1991), paragraph two of the syllabus.

{¶ 24} Although Caslin's second assignment of error challenges the denial of his motion for acquittal, this does not necessitate a separate review because "[a] motion for acquittal under Crim.R. 29(A) is governed by the same standard as the one for determining whether a verdict is supported by sufficient evidence." *State v. Tenace*, 109 Ohio St.3d 255, 2006-Ohio-2417, ¶ 37, citing *State v. Carter*, 72 Ohio St.3d 545, 553 (1995); *Thompkins* at 386.

{¶ 25} Caslin, in his third assignment of error, challenges the manifest weight of the evidence. The Supreme Court of Ohio has "carefully distinguished the terms 'sufficiency' and 'weight' * * *, declaring that 'manifest weight' and 'legal sufficiency' are 'both quantitatively and qualitatively different.'" *Eastley* at ¶ 10, quoting *Thompkins* at paragraph two of the syllabus.

Weight of the evidence concerns "the inclination *of the greater amount of credible evidence*, offered in a trial, to support one side of the issue rather than the other. * * *. Weight is not a question of mathematics, but depends on its *effect in inducing belief*."

(Emphasis sic.) *Eastley* at ¶ 12, quoting *Thompkins* at 387; *Black's* at 1594. In manifest weight analysis, "the appellate court sits as a 'thirteenth juror' and disagrees with the jury's resolution of the conflicting testimony." *Thompkins* at 387, quoting *Tibbs v. Florida*. 457 U.S. 31, 42 (1982). "The court, reviewing the entire record, weighs the evidence and all reasonable inferences, considers the credibility of witnesses and determines whether in resolving conflicts in the evidence, the jury clearly lost its way and created such a manifest miscarriage of justice that the conviction must be reversed and a new trial ordered." *Thompkins* at 387, quoting *State v. Martin*, 20 Ohio App.3d 172, 175 (1st Dist.1983).

{¶ 26} Caslin, in his brief, makes no attempt to argue that the events described by the witnesses in this case did not happen or that they do not constitute aggravated burglary, kidnapping, aggravated robbery, rape, gross sexual imposition, and tampering with evidence, all facilitated by the use of a firearm. (Caslin Brief at 14-22; Aug. 11, 2016 Indictment.) Presumably because of laws of complicity (*see* R.C. 2923.03), Caslin also does not dispute that other perpetrators who were in G.E. and S.R.'s home on April 30, 2015, are guilty of everything for which he has been convicted. (Caslin Brief at 14-22.) Rather his sole argument is mistaken identity. *Id.* He argues the evidence was insufficient to establish that he was involved and, even if the evidence was sufficient, in light of the credibility problems of Wallace and Hand, the conclusion that he was a participant in the crimes is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Id.*

{¶ 27} It is true that neither G.E. nor S.R. could identify their assailants, and it is true that neither Caslin's DNA nor fingerprints were found anywhere in the apartment. (Tr. at 200, 202, 236-37, 546.) It is also true that Wallace and Hand were not trustworthy people, had lied to the police, and their statements presented a number of inconsistencies about exactly who among the group of perpetrators was doing what and when. *See supra* at ¶ 3-7, 11-14. But they both said Caslin was involved and their testimony was otherwise largely confirmed by the victim's accounts and the physical evidence, even down to unusual details like the pouring of nail polish concerning S.R. and the fact that someone told S.R., while she was being raped, to say how much she loved "squad dick." *See supra* at ¶ 3-14.

The Facebook screenshot revealed Caslin had "SQAD" tattooed across the knuckles of his right hand, and he was romantically involved with Brianna Booker, who sold S.R.'s stolen cellular phone. (State's Exs. T, U2.) "[V]iewing the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution, a[] rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime[s] proven beyond a reasonable doubt." *Monroe* at ¶ 47. Moreover, even weighing the evidence as a 13th juror, we cannot say that "the jury clearly lost its way and created such a manifest miscarriage of justice that the conviction must be reversed and a new trial ordered." *Thompkins* at 387.

{¶ 28} Caslin's first, second, and third assignments of error are overruled.

IV. CONCLUSION

{¶ 29} The trial court did not err in refusing to exclude a Facebook screen shot on the basis of authenticity where the analyst who took the screen shot testified and provided a sufficient foundation to support its admissibility. Despite witness inconsistencies and credibility problems, the evidence against Caslin was sufficient to convict him and his conviction was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. We overrule all of Caslin's assignments of error and affirm the judgment of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas.

Judgment affirmed.

DORRIAN and HORTON, JJ., concur.
