

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KAMERON SCOTT,	§	
	§	No. 14, 2026
Defendant Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below–Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware
v.	§	
	§	C.A. No. K2410009742A/B
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	
	§	
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: July 15, 2026
Decided: August 18, 2026

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **LEGROW** and **GRIFFITHS**, Justices.

ORDER

After careful consideration of the parties’ briefs and the record on appeal, it appears to the Court that:

(1) Kameron Scott appeals from his conviction for carrying a concealed deadly weapon (“CCDW”). Scott contends that the trial court erred by failing to acquit him, *sua sponte*, after the State failed to present evidence that he concealed a firearm. After careful review of the record, we find that there was sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to infer that Scott carried a concealed deadly weapon on the day in question. We therefore affirm his conviction.

(2) On October 18, 2024, Dover Police Department Corporal Brian Gedney, along with a few other Dover police officers, worked security for a football game at Dover High School.¹ While the officers were standing inside the stadium, a fight broke out in the parking lot. Corporal Gedney, followed by the other officers, ran towards the skirmish. Upon reaching the parking lot, Corporal Gedney saw the defendant, Kameron Scott, “pull a firearm from his right hand, point it in the air, and fire one round.”²

(3) After firing the shot, Scott saw Corporal Gedney and the other Dover police officers rushing toward him. Scott fled. Corporal Gedney and the Dover officers chased Scott through a grassy area to a nearby apartment complex, but they lost sight of him. Officer Daniel Kaufman apprehended Scott a short time later near the apartment complex.³ Scott did not have a firearm in his possession at the time of his arrest. After retracing their steps along the chase route, the police officers recovered a firearm.

¹ App. to Opening Br. at A16 [hereinafter A_] (Trial Tr. Excerpts dated Oct. 7, 2025, at 19:3–23) (M/Cpl. Brian Gedney) [hereinafter Oct. 7 Tr.].

² A25 (Oct. 7 Tr. 31:6–8) (M/Cpl. Brian Gedney).

³ A73 (Trial Tr. Excerpts dated Oct. 8, 2025, at 33:22–4:9) (Officer Daniel Kauffman).

(4) A grand jury indicted Scott on one count each of possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony; riot; CCDW; possession of a firearm in a safe school zone; resisting arrest; and two counts of weapon-related offenses.⁴

(5) At trial, the State called Dover Police Detective Diego Zamora to testify. Detective Zamora was not present when the shot was fired, but he reviewed and analyzed the responding officers' body-camera footage. Detective Zamora prepared a report summarizing his findings.⁵ At defense counsel's request, Detective Zamora read portions of the report into the trial record to refresh his recollection of the events. Notably, Detective Zamora read that "Gedney was close to the scene when . . . [Scott] fired a gun into the air and then placed it back into his waistband."⁶ Scott did not object to Detective Zamora reading the report into the record.⁷

(6) The State also presented video evidence to the jury. The State first showed the jury security camera footage from the stadium's entrance and parking

⁴ A9–13 (Grand Jury Indictment dated Feb. 3, 2025).

⁵ App. to Answering Br. at B22 [hereinafter B_] (Trial Tr. Excerpts dated Oct. 8, 2025, at 89:9–18) (Diego Zamora) [hereinafter Oct. 8 Tr.].

⁶ B22 (Oct. 8 Tr. 91:6–12) (Det. Diego Zamora).

⁷ Scott argues, for the first time on appeal, that Detective Zamora's report was inadmissible and should therefore be disregarded. This evidentiary issue was not raised until Scott filed his Reply Brief on appeal. *See* Reply Br. 1–4 (May 5, 2026) [hereinafter Reply Br.]. We deem this argument waived. *See Murphy v. State*, 632 A.2d 1150, 1152 (Del. 1993) ("The failure to raise a legal issue in the text of the opening brief generally constitutes a waiver of that claim on appeal." (footnote omitted)).

lot.⁸ That video footage showed Scott standing in the parking lot, before the fight broke out, with no visible weapon.⁹ The State then played video footage from the Corporal Gedney’s body-worn camera, which showed Scott holding a gun in his right hand, pointed at the ground, with a finger over the trigger.¹⁰

(7) Scott did not move for a judgment of acquittal during trial. The jury acquitted Scott of the riot count but convicted him on all other counts.¹¹ Scott appealed to this Court, challenging only his conviction for CCDW.

(8) “In the absence of a motion for . . . judgment of acquittal . . . this Court reviews claims of insufficient evidence for plain error.”¹² Plain errors are “material defects which are apparent on the face of the record, which are basic, serious, and fundamental in their character and which clearly deprive an accused of a substantial right, or which clearly show manifest injustice.”¹³

⁸ B27 (Trial Tr. Excerpts dated Oct. 10, 2025, at 19:19–21).

⁹ State’s Ex. 2 (Dover High Surveillance Video 1); *accord* A135 (Image from video footage).

¹⁰ State’s Ex. 1 (M/Cpl. Gedney’s body camera footage); *accord* A135–36 (Images from video footage).

¹¹ A5 (Super. Ct. Crim. Dkt. No. 27). The Superior Court later dismissed Scott’s conviction for possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony because the jury acquitted him of the underlying felony—riot.

¹² *Swan v. State*, 820 A.2d 342, 358 (Del. 2003).

¹³ *Suber v. State*, ---A.3d---, 2026 WL 184867, at *5 (Del. Jan. 15, 2026) (quoting *Wainwright v. State*, 504 A.2d 1096, 1100 (Del. 1986)).

(9) In reviewing an insufficiency-of-the-evidence claim, the Court assesses whether, “considering the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.”¹⁴

(10) Scott claims that the State failed to introduce evidence at trial that showed he concealed a deadly weapon.¹⁵ Under Delaware law, “[a] person is guilty of carrying a concealed deadly weapon when the person carries concealed a deadly weapon upon or about the person without a license to do so[.]”¹⁶ A weapon is “concealed” if it is “hidden from the ordinary sight of another person.”¹⁷ Scott maintains that the State did not present evidence of where he pulled the weapon from before firing it, or where he put it afterwards.¹⁸

(11) Scott’s argument is meritless. The State presented sufficient evidence to establish the “concealed” element of CCDW. The jury was able to compare video footage showing Scott standing in the parking lot with no visible weapon with video

¹⁴ *Goode v. State*, 136 A.3d 303, 314 (Del. 2016).

¹⁵ Opening Br. 14 (Mar. 22, 2026) [hereinafter Opening Br.].

¹⁶ 11 *Del. C.* § 1442.

¹⁷ *Watson v. State*, 340 A.3d 1133, 2025 WL 1100940, at *3 (Del. 2025) (TABLE).

¹⁸ Opening Br. 11–12.

footage of Scott holding a firearm.¹⁹ By comparing the videos, a reasonable juror could infer that Scott concealed the weapon on his person before firing it.²⁰

(12) Scott argues that he could have obtained the firearm after arriving at the parking lot, instead of concealing it on his person.²¹ This Court has held that “[a]n alternative explanation of the facts that is consistent with innocence does not mandate a finding of insufficient evidence.”²² The mere possibility that Scott might have obtained the weapon from somewhere else does not justify reversal of the jury’s verdict.

(13) Based on our review, the State presented sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to conclude that Scott concealed a firearm on his person. Therefore, the trial court did not commit plain error in failing to *sua sponte* acquit him of CCDW.

¹⁹ State’s Ex. 1 (M/Cpl. Gedney’s body camera footage); *accord* A135–36 (Images from video footage).

²⁰ *See e.g., Monroe v. State*, 652 A.2d 560, 563 (Del. 1995) (holding that “the State’s evidence, though purely circumstantial, was sufficient to sustain the jury’s finding that the appliance center was burglarized” when the State’s witnesses only testified about seeing the aftermath of the burglary).

²¹ Reply Br. 5–6.

²² *Morales v. State*, 696 A.2d 390, 394 (Del. 1997).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ N. Christopher Griffiths
Justice