



ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Janet Lynn Thompson
Hoover Hull Turner LLP
Indianapolis, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE

Theodore E. Rokita
Indiana Attorney General
Megan M. Smith
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

Jordyn L. Maddox,
Appellant-Defendant,

v.

State of Indiana,
Appellee-Plaintiff

August 7, 2023

Court of Appeals Case No.
23A-CR-327

Appeal from the Pulaski Superior
Court

The Honorable Crystal A. Kocher,
Judge

Trial Court Cause No.
66D01-2112-F6-147

Opinion by Judge Crone
Judge Brown and Senior Judge Robb concur.

Crone, Judge.

[1] A jury found Jordyn L. Maddox guilty of possessing methamphetamine, a controlled substance, and paraphernalia. On appeal, she challenges the constitutionality of the search of her residence and the admissibility of the

incriminating evidence seized. At trial, she stated that she had “[n]o objections” to the admission of the evidence. Tr. Vol. 2 at 127. Our supreme court has stated that “we will not review claims, even for fundamental error, when appellants expressly declare at trial that they have no objection.” *Taylor v. State*, 86 N.E.3d 157, 161 (Ind. 2017) (citing *Halliburton v. State*, 1 N.E.3d 670, 678-79 (Ind. 2013)), *cert. denied* (2018). Accordingly, we will not review Maddox’s claims of error and fundamental error, and we affirm her convictions.¹

[2] Affirmed.

Brown, J., and Robb, Sr.J., concur.

¹ In her reply brief, Maddox urges us to consider her fundamental error claim, citing cases from this Court that were decided before *Taylor* and *Halliburton*. “As Indiana’s intermediate appellate court, we are bound by Indiana Supreme Court precedent and are not at liberty to ‘reconsider’ that precedent.” *Hill v. State*, 122 N.E.3d 979, 982 (Ind. Ct. App. 2019) (quoting *Minor v. State*, 36 N.E.3d 1065, 1074 (Ind. Ct. App. 2015), *trans. denied*), *trans. denied*.