

FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-11986

GEORGE MARTIN,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

COMMISSIONER, ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 1:21-cv-00460-TFM-MU

Before JORDAN, JILL PRYOR, and KIDD, Circuit Judges.

KIDD, Circuit Judge:

The State of Alabama committed prosecutorial misconduct in the first trial of George Martin, a former Alabama State Trooper who was accused of killing his wife for pecuniary gain. Because of this misconduct, the state had to try Martin a second time. But at the second trial, the trial judge precluded Martin from raising certain issues concerning the prosecutorial misconduct in the first trial. Martin has now filed a federal habeas corpus petition to challenge his conviction from the second trial. The district court denied Martin's petition, and he has now appealed the denial to us.

On appeal, Martin claims that the state trial court's preclusion order violated the rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution's Confrontation Clause and prevented him from presenting a complete defense. He also argues that the state presented insufficient evidence for the jury to find that he murdered his wife for pecuniary gain, which was the aggravating factor necessary to impose the sentence of life without parole.

Alabama's misconduct in Martin's case was egregious, and the state courts found as much. But our habeas corpus review is limited by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Those limitations constrain us to affirm the district court's denial of habeas relief.

I. BACKGROUND

Because this habeas case arises from a lengthy and complex procedural history spanning two trials almost two decades apart, our discussion of that history is divided into five parts. First, we

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

3

discuss the evidence presented during Martin's first trial and the direct appeal of his first conviction. Second, we discuss the collateral proceedings that revealed the state committed prosecutorial misconduct before Martin's trial, which led the trial court to grant Martin a second trial. Third, we discuss the direct appeal proceedings that led to Martin being granted a second trial. Fourth, we discuss the preclusion order entered and the murder-for-pecuniary-gain evidence presented during Martin's second trial, as well as the direct appeal of his second conviction. Finally, we discuss the facts regarding the federal habeas proceedings below.

A. First Trial and Direct Appeal

On October 8, 1995, around 11:30 p.m., law enforcement and emergency responders discovered a black 1991 Ford Escort that had collided with a tree and was on fire on the side of a road in Tillman's Corner, Alabama. Inside the vehicle was the body of Hammoleketh Martin, George Martin's wife.

At the time of his wife's death, Martin was an Alabama State Trooper. The Mobile County District Attorney's Office investigated Martin for his wife's death but ultimately decided not to prosecute him after failing to obtain a grand jury indictment. Alabama Attorney General's Office then initiated another investigation and, four years later, obtained a grand jury indictment.

In June 1999, Martin was indicted and charged with capital murder done for a pecuniary or other valuable consideration, in violation of Alabama Code § 13A-5-40(a)(7). The state's initial theory was that Martin deliberately set his wife's car on fire and staged

the scene to appear as if a traffic collision had caused the fire. The state further theorized that Martin's motive for killing his wife was for financial gain—life insurance money. Martin maintained he did not kill his wife. He told investigators that his wife's gas gauge did not work and she kept a red gas can in the back seat of her car.

The state's case was circumstantial. The state primarily relied upon a witness, James Taylor, who testified that two hours before Hammoleketh was discovered, he saw an African American trooper in uniform in his work vehicle parked near where she was found. During closing statements, the state argued the jury should conclude that (1) Martin, who is African American, fled the crime scene on a bicycle he planted there earlier; (2) other than Martin's relatives, no one had ever seen a gas can in his wife's vehicle; and (3) based on Taylor's testimony, they should infer that Martin was the trooper Taylor had seen.

We recount portions of the state appellate court's review of the trial evidence to provide context for the years of proceedings that followed, leading to this appeal.

A traffic homicide investigator from the Alabama Department of Public Safety testified that he examined the vehicle and the scene in question. He conducted speed calculations of a vehicle and analyzed the kind of force that would have been necessary to cause such a fire. He concluded that the fire was not an accident and the collision of the vehicle with a tree did not produce sufficient force to start the fire.

....

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

5

The state also introduced evidence of a traffic accident investigation report prepared by Martin approximately one year prior to the death of his wife. The report involved a traffic accident in which an automobile left the road, hit a tree, and burst into flames.

Martin v. State, 931 So. 2d 736, 740–41 (Ala. Crim. App. 2003) (citation modified), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part sub nom. Ex parte Martin v. State*, 931 So. 2d 736 (Ala. 2004), *aff'd on remand*, 931 So. 2d 774 (Ala. Crim. App. 2005). The state maintained that Martin staged the accident to look like the prior accident he investigated. *See id.* at 741.

The state also attacked Martin's credibility. The prosecution argued that Martin was untruthful about whether Hammoleketh carried a gasoline can. *See id.* at 740. The state further argued that Martin was untruthful about the number of life insurance policies Hammoleketh had. *Id.* Though Martin acknowledged the existence of a \$200,000 policy, the state maintained he lied when he stated there were no other policies. *Id.* The state introduced evidence to support that there was another \$150,000 policy that was collectible only if Hammoleketh died in a passenger vehicle. *Id.* at 740–41. The state connected Martin's purported need to collect the insurance proceeds by eliciting testimony that his financial condition had worsened to near bankruptcy. *Id.* at 741.

In May 2000, the jury convicted Martin of capital murder for pecuniary gain. Despite the jury's recommendation by a vote of 8–4 that he be sentenced to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, the trial court judge overrode the jury's recommenda-

tion and sentenced Martin to death. The Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals (“ACCA”) affirmed Martin’s conviction and sentence, and Martin appealed to the Supreme Court of Alabama (“ASC”). The ASC affirmed Martin’s conviction but reversed the trial court’s ruling that overrode the jury’s life-imprisonment recommendation. The ASC then remanded the case to the ACCA with instructions to remand it to the trial court to reconsider its ruling based on new precedent. The trial court did so and resentenced Martin to death, and the ACCA upheld that ruling on appeal.

B. Postconviction Proceedings and Brady Violations

In 2006, Martin filed a petition for postconviction relief pursuant to Alabama Rule of Criminal Procedure 32. Specifically, Rule 32.1 permits a petitioner convicted of a criminal offense, and who has exhausted the direct appeals, to file a petition to seek relief on certain enumerated grounds in the court of original conviction. Ala. R. Crim. P. 32.1, 32.2(a)(1). Two of those grounds are at issue here: (1) if the state or federal constitution requires a new trial, and (2) newly discovered material facts exist that require the court to vacate the conviction or sentence. Ala. R. Crim. P. 32.1(a), (e). Prior to Martin’s trial, the judge entered an open file discovery order. During the course of that proceeding, Martin discovered that the state failed to disclose several pieces of material evidence that were favorable to his defense in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S.

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

7

83 (1963).

From 2006 until 2011, Martin litigated for access to the state's file. In 2009, the trial court ordered the state to provide Martin with all documents in its file. The ACCA and then the ASC denied the state's petitions for a writ of mandamus challenging the court's order. Then, in 2011, the trial court conducted an in camera inspection of the state's file and ordered the state to produce all materials except those it deemed privileged.

In 2012, the court held a fifteen-day evidentiary hearing that included testimony from 28 witnesses and the introduction of 104 exhibits. After the hearing, the court concluded that the prosecution had failed to disclose four pieces of evidence that were favorable to Martin's defense in violation of *Brady*. We discuss each before turning to the proceedings that followed the court granting Martin's petition for a new trial based on those violations.

1. Taylor Implicated Another Suspect

During the trial, the prosecution never asked Taylor to identify Martin as the trooper he saw, and there was no evidence presented concerning the size of the trooper Taylor saw. After receiving the state's file, Martin discovered for the first time that Major Thomas Calhoun of the Mobile Police Department interviewed Taylor twice, in April and May 1997, and Taylor provided Calhoun with evidence that was favorable to Martin's defense. At the Rule 32 hearing, Calhoun testified he was responsible for deciding what materials would be turned over to Martin's defense. The court found most of Calhoun's testimony about his discovery-handling

practices not credible.

During the April 1997 interview, Calhoun wrote in his notes that Taylor told him the trooper he saw was a “large black man.” For trial, he typed a summary of this interview. A portion of the summary was read to the jury, but the summary was never marked for identification or introduced as an exhibit. Critically, the summary omitted Taylor’s statement regarding the size of the trooper he saw. And Calhoun’s original notes from the interview were never turned over to the defense or used by the state at trial. Based on its observations, the court determined Martin “[was] not a large man” because he was five feet, six inches tall.

During his May 1997 interview, Taylor was shown a photographic array containing thirteen African American troopers, including Martin. Taylor identified another trooper, Grayling Williams, as the one he had seen the night of the murder. The court credited Martin’s defense counsel’s testimony that the state never turned over Taylor’s identification of Williams. Additionally, Calhoun wrote in his notes that Taylor similarly relayed that the trooper he saw was a “big man that filled up the car.” The state did not dispute that this note was never turned over to the defense. The court observed that Williams seemed to match Taylor’s descriptions because he was five feet, eleven inches tall and weighed 198 pounds in 1995.

Without Taylor’s testimony, the state had no witness or other evidence to place Martin at the scene. Notably, Calhoun was present in court during Martin’s trial when the state argued that

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

9

the jury could infer from Taylor's testimony that Martin was the man Taylor saw at the scene.

2. Anonymous Calls Implicating Other Suspects

The state also withheld two anonymous calls implicating other suspects. The first call was placed to the Alabama Department of Public Safety in October 1995. The caller indicated that Hammoleketh was "running around with two white troopers" in a nearby county when Martin was at work. The second call was placed to the Mobile Police Department in November 1995. Notably, the caller indicated that Williams was involved in Hammoleketh's death. At the Rule 32 hearing, the court credited Martin's defense counsel's testimony that he never received information about these calls.

3. Norma Broach Implicated Another Suspect

At the hearing, Norma Broach testified that she was at a nearby gas station on the night of Hammoleketh's death. Broach said that she saw a "white camper truck" and a small black car that matched the description of Hammoleketh's vehicle parked along the highway not far from where Hammoleketh was found. According to Broach, a white man drove the truck to the gas station, went inside the station, filled up two gas cans, and then drove back and parked next to the black car. She then saw the man drag and push "a heavy object" into the passenger side of the truck cab before he sped off toward the area where Hammoleketh was found.

The next day, when Broach saw on the news that a woman's body had been found in a burned-out car near the gas station, she

called the Crimestoppers hotline to relay what she had seen the day prior. Broach reported what she had seen to two Mobile Police Department investigators, and also to Williams. Otherwise, law enforcement did not contact her. Broach was not a witness at Martin's trial. She continued contacting law enforcement for years about what she had witnessed.

The officers who testified at the hearing were uncertain about when they learned of Broach. But a handwritten note from another officer dated October 22, 1995, was admitted as an exhibit, which stated that Broach was at the gas station one hour before Hammoleketh was found and saw a man enter and buy gas. The court determined a jury could find Broach's testimony credible. And it was undisputed at the hearing that Broach's identity, her statements, and the October 22, 1995, note were never turned over to Martin's defense counsel.

4. Gas Can Evidence

During the trial, the prosecution told the jury that Martin was not credible when he told officers that his wife carried a gas can in her car because (1) only Martin's relatives and none of his wife's friends saw her carry a gas can, and (2) the arson investigators did not find remnants of a gas can at the scene.

In May 1997, Calhoun interviewed Hammoleketh's sister, Terri Jean Jackson. His handwritten notes from the interview reflected that Jackson stated she saw "a small red plastic gas can" in her sister's car before the incident. The court determined that the

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

11

state never provided this evidence to the defense and thus violated *Brady*.

During Martin's trial, several firefighters testified that no remnants of a gas can were found. At the Rule 32 hearing, Martin presented evidence that several officers had seen or were aware that remnants of what appeared to be a plastic gas can were recovered from Hammoleketh's car. Although the court did not find that the state committed a *Brady* violation, it noted that the state does not contest this information was never disclosed to the defense.

C. Martin's Indictment Dismissed with Prejudice

In 2013, the court granted Martin's Rule 32 petition and ruled that Martin was entitled to a new trial based on the *Brady* violations. In 2014, the ACCA affirmed the decision, and the ASC denied review on April 17, 2015. On May 7, 2015, the trial court granted Martin's motion for release pending his new trial.

By the time Martin was released, he had been on death row for fifteen years. Martin then moved to dismiss his capital murder indictment with prejudice pursuant to Alabama Rule of Criminal Procedure 16.5. In 2016, the court granted the motion as a sanction after determining that the state's prosecutorial misconduct was willful and that a new trial would not cure any resulting prejudice to Martin.

The court found the state's misconduct to be willful because Calhoun, aware of Taylor's prior identification of Williams and description of the trooper, remained silent while prosecutors argued the jury should infer Martin was the trooper Taylor saw. Calhoun

further sat silent when prosecutors argued there was no evidence of the gas can, even though the officer knew that was untrue because Hammoleketh's sister stated she saw a gas can. The court found that Martin was prejudiced because it had been sixteen years since the trial, twenty years since the event, and many witnesses were deceased or no longer remembered key details. The court also found prejudice because Taylor no longer recalled his previous statements about the other suspect's size during the Rule 32 hearing.

The ACCA upheld the dismissal of an indictment as a sanction for prosecutorial misconduct. *State v. Martin*, 287 So. 3d 355 (Ala. Crim. App. 2017), *rev'd sub nom.*, *Ex parte State v. Martin*, 287 So. 3d 384 (Ala. 2018). But the ASC reversed and remanded the case to the trial court for a new trial. *Martin*, 287 So. 3d at 399. The ASC held that neither the death of two unnamed witnesses nor Taylor's loss of memory established irreparable prejudice to warrant dismissal. *Id.* at 397–99. According to the ASC, Taylor was available to testify, and Martin now had his prior statements with which to impeach him if necessary. *Id.* at 398.

D. Second Trial and Direct Appeal

The judge who presided over the Rule 32 proceedings and dismissed the indictment retired, and a new judge presided over the second trial.

1. Preclusion Order

Before trial began, the state filed a motion in limine to exclude any mention of prosecutorial misconduct, discovery violations, or withholding of evidence from questions, inferences, notations, observations, statements, or communications by the defense. Additionally, the state moved to exclude the trial court's rulings regarding certain witnesses' credibility. The state maintained that if the trial court permitted the jury to hear about any of its misconduct, it would create "an undue prejudice to which the [s]tate could not reasonably surmount."

Martin filed a motion in limine to prevent the exclusion of such evidence. Martin maintained that evidence of the state's misconduct should not be excluded for several reasons. First, it was centrally relevant to Martin's defense that he was innocent and on trial a second time nineteen years later because the state's case was weak and skewed by a flawed investigation, bias, and non-credible initial investigators as evidenced by the numerous *Brady* violations. Second, he had a Sixth Amendment right to confront the state's witnesses on these topics. Third, the state should be sanctioned for its misconduct; specifically, Martin argued he would be unable to put on a complete defense because they could not pursue all of the previously buried leads twenty years after Hammoleketh's death. Fourth, without the ability to introduce evidence of the state's misconduct, the jury would receive a one-sided presentation of the evidence that Martin would not be able to overcome.

After holding a hearing on the motions, the trial court entered a one-page order granting the state's motion and denying Martin's. Specifically, the trial court determined "it would be confusing and overly prejudicial to allow [Martin] to attempt to explain the long and complicated procedural history of this case to the jury, and that most, if not all, of this material [wa]s not relevant. For the same reasons, [Martin's] request for preclusion sanctions, adverse inferences, and jury instructions would be unduly prejudicial."

The day after the court entered the preclusion order, it noted in a telephonic hearing in response to Martin's motion for clarification that it expected Martin's defense to get into the state's failure to pursue leads, alternative theories, alternative suspects, and the state's allegedly biased conduct. However, the court cautioned the defense that these matters could not be introduced through any evidence, cross-examination, or argument concerning the prior trial, the Rule 32 proceedings, the proceedings on the motion for a new trial, or the motion to dismiss the indictment.

The court emphasized that, despite its best efforts, it could not fashion a jury instruction or a remedy to explain the state's misconduct in the original trial, and doing so would cause confusion and amount to a trial within a trial if the door were opened to address any of the state's misconduct.

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

15

2. Evidence Presented During Second Trial

Taylor, Broach, Williams, and Jackson all testified at the second trial.

During the first trial, one of the arguments the state made to prove that Martin killed his wife for pecuniary gain was that he did not disclose to investigators all the life insurance policies that covered his wife. Specifically, the state maintained that Martin did not disclose a \$150,000 policy that was payable only if Hammoleketh died in a passenger vehicle. In its case-in-chief, the state introduced a copy of the policy into evidence through an insurance company witness.

During the second trial, the state never admitted a copy of the policy into evidence. And the state withdrew its only witness to prove murder for pecuniary gain and instead maintained at sidebar that “[t]he mere existence of an insurance policy is the only thing that is [relevant] to the [s]tate’s case in chief[.]” The state bore the burden to prove pecuniary gain; nevertheless, in Martin’s case-in-chief, he presented testimony from an accounting expert and life insurance expert to rebut that he murdered his wife for pecuniary gain. They testified that Martin was in good financial health and the amount of life insurance policies Hammoleketh had were normal and did not raise any red flags. But this opened Martin’s witnesses to cross-examination by the state, which attacked those conclusions.

On June 7, 2019, the second jury found Martin guilty of capital murder for pecuniary gain, and the court sentenced him to life

imprisonment without the possibility of parole. The trial court denied Martin's request for a new trial or judgment of acquittal. Martin appealed his second conviction to the ACCA. As relevant to this appeal, Martin maintained that the trial court's preclusion order violated his Confrontation Clause rights and precluded him from presenting a complete defense. He also argued that the state presented insufficient evidence for the jury to determine murder for pecuniary gain, the aggravating factor necessary to sustain the capital murder conviction. The ACCA affirmed Martin's conviction and denied his request for rehearing, and the ASC summarily denied Martin's petition for certiorari.

E. The Federal Habeas Proceedings

After the ASC denied review, Martin filed a habeas corpus petition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, in the Southern District of Alabama based on the same three grounds raised in his direct appeal. The state did not address the merits of the confrontation and complete defense claims and instead argued they were procedurally defaulted. For the sufficiency of the evidence claim, the state conceded that Martin presented it on direct appeal but argued it failed on the merits.

The magistrate judge recommended that the district judge deny in part and dismiss in part Martin's petition and grant him a certificate of appealability for his confrontation and complete defense claims, but not his sufficiency of the evidence claim ("COA"). The magistrate judge, sua sponte, concluded that Martin's suffi-

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

17

ciency of the evidence claim was unexhausted and procedurally defaulted, and declined to address it on the merits. The magistrate judge then determined that Martin's confrontation and complete defense claims were not procedurally defaulted and failed on the merits.

The state objected to the magistrate judge's determination that Martin's confrontation and complete defense claims were not procedurally defaulted. Martin objected to the magistrate judge's determination that AEDPA deference applied to review of his confrontation and complete defense claims. Alternatively, he maintained that his confrontation claim and complete defense claims should succeed on the merits under AEDPA deference. He further objected to the magistrate judge's determination that his sufficiency of the evidence claim was procedurally defaulted and maintained that relief should be granted on the merits, or alternatively that he should be granted a COA on that claim.

The district judge adopted the report and recommendation, overruled Martin's and the state's objections, and alternatively found that the sufficiency claim failed on the merits. The district court granted Martin a COA and entered final judgment. Martin's COA specifies these issues:

- (1) Whether the state waived any exhaustion defense to the sufficiency claim by acknowledging that the claim "was presented on direct appeal" in its response to the petition;

(2) Whether Martin exhausted his sufficiency claim in state court by bringing state law claims based on the same “reasonable doubt” standard applicable to federal claims;

(3) Whether, if the sufficiency claim was exhausted, the Alabama courts’ conclusion that the state sufficiently proved that Martin committed murder for pecuniary gain was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law or was based on an unreasonable determination of facts in light of the evidence;

(4) Whether the Alabama courts’ decision to uphold the preclusion order was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, specifically the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment;

(5) Whether the Alabama courts’ decision to uphold the preclusion order was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, specifically the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution and the ensuing right to present a complete defense.

Doc. 40 at 1–2 (citation modified).

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

“We review a court’s decision to deny a § 2254 petition de novo, applying a de novo standard to legal conclusions and a clear error standard to factual findings.” *Carruth v. Comm’r, Ala. Dep’t of Corr.*, 93 F.4th 1338, 1352 (11th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 145 S. Ct. 208 (2024).

If “a claim is properly presented to the state court, but the state court does not adjudicate it on the merits, we review de novo.” *Mason v. Allen*, 605 F.3d 1114, 1119 (11th Cir. 2010) (emphasis omitted). But when a state court adjudicates a petitioner’s claim on the merits, AEDPA further governs our review. AEDPA prohibits relief unless the state court’s decision was (1) “contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States,” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1); or (2) “based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding,” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2). “If a state court unreasonably applied federal law or unreasonably determined the facts in a case, we review the underlying claim de novo.” *King v. Warden, Ga. Diagnostic Prison*, 69 F.4th 856, 867 (11th Cir. 2023) (emphasis omitted).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1), a state court’s decision is “contrary to . . . clearly established Federal law” when it “appl[ies] a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth by Supreme Court case law,” or when it “reach[es] a different result from the Supreme Court when faced with materially indistinguishable facts.” *Davis v.*

Comm’r, Ala. Dep’t of Corr., 120 F.4th 768, 788 (11th Cir. 2024) (citation modified), *petition for cert. filed*, No. 25-1410 (U.S. June 18, 2026). An “unreasonable application of . . . clearly established Federal law,” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1), occurs when “the state court correctly identifies the governing legal principle . . . but unreasonably applies it to the facts of the particular case.” *Davis*, 120 F.4th at 788 (citation modified). “A state court unreasonably applies federal law only if no fairminded jurist could agree with the state court’s determination or conclusion.” *King*, 69 F.4th at 867 (citation modified).

For our review of habeas corpus petitions filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2), “a state court’s factual determinations are ‘presumed to be correct,’” and that presumption can be overcome only “by clear and convincing evidence.” *Pye v. Warden, Ga. Diagnostic Prison*, 50 F.4th 1025, 1035 (11th Cir. 2022) (en banc) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1)). Still, “[e]ven if the state court made a clearly erroneous factual determination, that doesn’t necessarily mean the state court’s ‘decision’ was ‘based on’ an ‘unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.’” *Id.* (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2)). “Depending on the importance of the factual error to the state court’s ultimate ‘decision,’ that decision might still be reasonable even if some of the state court’s individual factual findings were erroneous—so long as the decision, taken as a whole, doesn’t constitute an ‘unreasonable determination of the facts’ and isn’t ‘based on’ any such determination.” *Id.* (citation modified).

III. DISCUSSION

We begin our discussion by examining whether Martin's claims were procedurally defaulted. Finding no default, we next explain why Martin's confrontation claim is not subject to AEDPA deference but still fails under our de novo review. Then, we discuss why AEDPA deference applies to Martin's complete defense claim and why it fails under that standard. Finally, we explain why Martin's sufficiency of the evidence claim fails under AEDPA.

A. Procedural Default

On appeal, the state argues that Martin has procedurally defaulted all three of his claims. Martin maintains he did not procedurally default his claims because he exhausted them by raising them throughout his state court proceedings.

"Habeas petitioners generally cannot raise claims in federal court that were not first exhausted in state court." *Kelley v. Sec'y, Fla. Dep't of Corr.*, 377 F.3d 1317, 1343 (11th Cir. 2004). Whether a petitioner exhausted a claim presents a mixed question of law and fact, subject to our de novo review. *See Fox v. Kelso*, 911 F.2d 563, 568 (11th Cir. 1990). "To properly exhaust a claim, the petitioner must afford the State a full and fair opportunity to address and resolve the claim on the merits." *Kelley*, 377 F.3d at 1343 (citation modified).

The exhaustion requirement is not satisfied if the petitioner (1) fails to raise a federal claim in the state court, *see Bailey v. Nagle*, 172 F.3d 1299, 1303 (11th Cir. 1999), or (2) fails to raise a claim in terms of federal law, *Jimenez v. Fla. Dep't of Corr.*, 481 F.3d 1337, 1342 (11th Cir. 2007). A petitioner is not required, however, to give "a

separate federal law heading to each of the claims they raise in state court to ensure exhaustion for federal review.” *Kelley*, 377 F.3d at 1344. Instead, we “simply require that petitioners present their claims to the state courts such that the reasonable reader would understand each claim’s particular legal basis and specific factual foundation.” *Id.* at 1344–45.

1. Confrontation and Complete Defense

The state argues Martin did not exhaust his confrontation and complete defense claims because the Alabama Rules of Evidence govern witness testimony on prior misconduct or evidence suppression, and the ACCA addressed Martin’s challenge to the preclusion order under those rules. As Martin states in his reply, however, the state’s argument is misplaced because exhaustion depends on whether the petitioner *presented* the claim to the state courts, not how the state courts resolved it. *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270, 275 (1971) (“[O]nce the federal claim has been fairly presented to the state courts, the exhaustion requirement is satisfied.”).

The state concedes in its briefing that, on direct appeal, Martin cited federal case law in arguing “that he had the constitutional right to ‘question the [s]tate’s witnesses about their own misconduct and their actions to cover up that misconduct.’” Martin’s confrontation claim presented in his habeas petition is a “carbon cop[y] of the claim[]” he “presented to the state courts.” *Kelley*, 377 F.3d at 1344. We conclude that Martin exhausted his confrontation claim by presenting it at each level of the Alabama courts. *Id.*

We likewise agree with the district court that Martin exhausted his complete defense claim by presenting it at each level of the Alabama courts. Martin presented his claim in his motion in limine in the trial court. Additionally, Martin presented his claim in his brief submitted to the ACCA and in his petition asking the ASC for a writ of certiorari.

2. Sufficiency of the Evidence

Martin maintains the district court erred in sua sponte ruling that his sufficiency of the evidence claim was not exhausted, because the state waived an exhaustion defense. The state argues it did not waive exhaustion because, in its view, acknowledging that Martin raised a sufficiency claim and addressing it on the merits is not a waiver of an exhaustion defense. We agree with Martin.

“States can waive procedural bar defenses in federal habeas proceedings, including exhaustion.” *Vazquez v. Sec’y, Fla. Dep’t of Corr.*, 827 F.3d 964, 966 (11th Cir. 2016) (citation modified). “A state’s mere failure to raise exhaustion does not constitute a waiver under AEDPA, which mandates that a State shall not be deemed to have waived the exhaustion requirement unless the State, through counsel, *expressly* waives the requirement.” *Id.* (citation modified); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(3).

In *Vazquez*, we determined that the state had waived exhaustion because it maintained the petitioner’s claim had been “raised at the state level.” 827 F.3d at 966–67 & n.1. This is similar to the state’s assertion here that Martin’s sufficiency of the evidence claim “was presented on direct appeal.” We explained that to determine

express waiver we look at the state's district court brief to see if the state communicates an intention not to pursue an exhaustion defense. *Id.* at 967.

Here, we conclude that the state reviewed the record and elected to address the sufficiency claim on the merits rather than assert an exhaustion defense for the following reasons. First, the state affirmatively represented that Martin presented the sufficiency claim on direct appeal. Second, the state devoted over five pages to analyzing the merits of Martin's sufficiency claim. Finally, the state expressly raised exhaustion as to Martin's confrontation and complete defense claims but *not* the sufficiency of the evidence claim. Therefore, "[b]ased on our review of the state's district court brief, we presume that the state examined the state court record and, in doing so, affirmatively concluded it need not pursue an exhaustion defense." *Id.*

Nevertheless, "where a state waives exhaustion, the district court may consider the procedural bar sua sponte if requiring the petitioner to return to state court to exhaust his claims serves an important federal interest." *Id.* at 966 (citation modified). We have identified several factors a district court may consider to determine whether to exercise its discretion to accept or reject a state's exhaustion waiver:

whether extensive or minimal fact finding is involved or only questions of law on an already adequate record and, if fact finding is involved, whether it may be done as part of a federal hearing required on other

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

25

issues; how long since petitioner’s conviction and sentence were imposed, how long state exhaustion will require, and the comparative status of the dockets of federal and state courts; and whether there are fundamental state policies at stake in the case or threshold issues of undecided state law.

Id. at 966–67 (citation modified) (quoting *Thompson v. Wainwright*, 714 F.2d 1495, 1509 (11th Cir. 1983)).

The district court “considering the exhaustion issue sua sponte . . . did not point to any ‘important federal interest’ or *Thompson* factors that required a rejection of the state’s waiver.” *Id.* at 967 (citation modified). Therefore, the district court erred in rejecting the state’s express waiver. *Id.* But “[b]ecause the district court did . . . make alternative findings regarding the merits of [Martin’s] claim,” we conclude this error was harmless, and we affirm the district court’s merits determination for the reasons discussed *infra* Part III.D. *Id.* at 968.

B. Confrontation

1. AEDPA Deference Does Not Apply

Martin maintains that AEDPA deference does not govern our review of his confrontation claim, which is based upon the preclusion order, because the ACCA did not review the claim on the merits. The state appears to agree because it maintains the ACCA treated the confrontation and complete defense claims “as a matter

of pure state law, not federal law . . . [because] the [A]CCA interpreted and applied only Alabama law to determine that the trial court properly excluded the evidence.”

“If . . . no state court has adjudicated the merits of a claim that was properly presented, federal habeas review is not subject to the deferential standard that applies under AEDPA[,] . . . and the claim is reviewed de novo.” *Brewster v. Hetzel*, 913 F.3d 1042, 1051 (11th Cir. 2019) (emphasis omitted) (citation modified). But we must begin with a presumption that the “federal claim was adjudicated on the merits.” *Johnson v. Williams*, 568 U.S. 289, 301 (2013). Nevertheless, the presumption is rebuttable. *Id.* The presumption may be rebutted, for example, if “a defendant claimed in state court that something that occurred at trial violated both a provision of the Federal Constitution and a related provision of state law, and . . . the state court, in denying relief, made no reference to federal law . . . [and] the state standard is *less* protective . . . [o]r . . . if the state standard is quite different from the federal standard.” *Id.* at 301–02; *see also Childers v. Floyd*, 736 F.3d 1331, 1334 (11th Cir. 2013) (en banc) (“To determine whether the presumption has been rebutted, we look to the state court’s decision and the record in the case to determine whether ‘the evidence leads very clearly to the conclusion that the federal claim was inadvertently overlooked in the state court.’” (citation modified) (quoting *Johnson*, 568 U.S. at 303)).

Martin presented his claim regarding the preclusion order as a violation of Alabama’s evidentiary rules *and* the Sixth Amendment right to confront witnesses. In its order denying relief, the ACCA referenced only Alabama Rules of Evidence 402 and 403 and *Ex parte Loggins*, 771 So. 2d 1093, 1103 (Ala. 2000). The ACCA did not mention or cite any state or federal case addressing Martin’s confrontation claim. Thus, for Martin to overcome our presumption that the ACCA adjudicated the claim on the merits, we must determine whether the “state-law rule[s] [that the ACCA relied on in denying relief subsume] the federal standard—that is, if [the rules were] at least as protective as the federal standard.” *Johnson*, 568 U.S. at 301. We conclude that they were not.

In *Childers*, we held that a Florida appellate court adjudicated a habeas petitioner’s confrontation claim on the merits, even though it analyzed the claim only under Florida’s evidentiary rules. 736 F.3d at 1334–35. We reasoned that Florida Rule of Evidence 90.608, which expressly permits impeachment through prior inconsistent statements, proof of bias, and other attacks on credibility, subject to Rule 90.403’s balancing test, “fit hand in glove with the rights guaranteed under the Confrontation Clause.” *Id.* at 1335. Thus, we said the state court’s application of Rule 90.608 necessarily resolved the same issues presented by the federal constitutional claim because “Florida’s rules of evidence gave [the petitioner] the same right of confrontation he enjoyed under the Confrontation Clause [which is] the right to expose a witness’s motivation in testifying.” *Id.* at 1334. (citation modified).

By contrast, Alabama Rules of Evidence 402 and 403 are general rules governing the admissibility of relevant evidence and the exclusion of relevant evidence whose probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations such as unfair prejudice, confusion, or delay. *See* Ala. R. Evid. 402, 403. Unlike Florida Rule 90.608, neither Alabama rule specifically governs impeachment by prior inconsistent statements, bias, or other forms of cross-examination protected by the Confrontation Clause. *Cf. Childers*, 736 F.3d at 1334–35.

The ACCA’s reference to *Ex parte Loggins* also does not lead us to presume that it adjudicated Martin’s confrontation claim on the merits. The portion of the *Loggins* decision that the ACCA quoted addressed whether the trial court improperly admitted photographic evidence of a murder victim’s mutilated body under Alabama’s evidentiary rules. *Loggins*, 771 So. 2d at 1103–05. The *Loggins* court did not address the exclusion of impeachment evidence or the limitation of cross-examination.

Because the ACCA did not apply the federal constitutional standard to the claim presented, and the state evidentiary standards the ACCA applied did not subsume the federal standard, “the evidence leads very clearly to the conclusion that a federal claim was inadvertently overlooked in state court.” *Johnson*, 568 U.S. at 303. And as noted, the state concedes that the ACCA treated Martin’s confrontation claim as a matter of purely state law, not federal law. *See Romine v. Head*, 253 F.3d 1349, 1365 (11th Cir. 2001) (determining that AEDPA deference did not apply when the Supreme Court

of Georgia did not apply any federal law and the State of Georgia “concede[d] that the Georgia Supreme Court did not apply federal law”). Therefore, we review Martin’s confrontation claim de novo. *Mason*, 605 F.3d at 1119.

2. Merits

Martin contends that the preclusion order prevented his trial counsel from asking the officers about investigative bias, why they failed to pursue leads, the state’s misconduct during the first trial, and how that influenced each witness’s view of his guilt. Martin generally argues that the preclusion order violated his right to confront several officers who testified at the second trial. But Martin provides a specific argument only as to one officer, Robert Scheer of the Alabama Bureau of Investigation. Therefore, we find that he abandoned any argument regarding the right to confront the other officers. *See Sapuppo v. Allstate Floridian Ins. Co.*, 739 F.3d 678, 680–81 (11th Cir. 2014) (explaining that a claim is abandoned if a party offers no argument or citation supporting it).

Under the Sixth Amendment, a criminal defendant has the right to confront his accusers, which includes the right to effective cross-examination. *Delaware v. Van Arsdall*, 475 U.S. 673, 679 (1986). Effective cross-examination requires that the defendant be able to expose a witness’s motivation and potential biases in testifying. *Id.* at 678–79. However, “trial judges retain wide latitude insofar as the Confrontation Clause is concerned to impose reasonable limits on such cross-examination based on concerns about, among other

things, harassment, prejudice, confusion of the issues, the witness'[s] safety, or interrogation that is repetitive or only marginally relevant.” *Id.* at 679. To decide whether a limitation on cross-examination violated the Confrontation Clause, we consider “whether a reasonable jury would have received a significantly different impression of the witness'[s] credibility had counsel pursued the proposed line of cross-examination.” *United States v. Whyte*, 928 F.3d 1317, 1334 (11th Cir. 2019) (citation modified).

The preclusion order barred “any . . . introduction of evidence, cross-examination, or argument concerning any of the prior procedural history” from the prior trial, the Rule 32 proceedings, the proceedings on the motion for new trial, or the motion to dismiss the indictment. This language excluded from trial lines of questioning concerning the procedural history and the Rule 32 court’s formal findings of misconduct based on the *Brady* violations. The order, however, did not prevent Martin from arguing the investigation was flawed. At the second trial Martin introduced the previously suppressed evidence and Williams, Taylor, Jackson, and Broach testified at the second trial. Additionally, a review of the record demonstrates that Martin elicited substantial cross-examination testimony from Scheer regarding the investigators’ purported failures to pursue leads and to investigate alternative suspects. Martin challenged Scheer’s selective reliance on Williams’s statement, suggested that the focus on him was premature, and developed a theme that Scheer uncritically accepted Williams’s account while minimally investigating Williams as an alternative sus-

pect. Martin also highlighted that Scheer failed to trace the anonymous call that implicated Williams, which implied investigative tunnel vision. Therefore, we find that the lines of questioning that the court allowed Martin to pursue exposed Scheer's potential bias and allowed the jury to evaluate his credibility, satisfying the Confrontation Clause.

Additionally, Martin repeatedly questioned Scheer about the investigators' failure to pursue Broach's lead and other potentially exculpatory evidence. Rather than merely asking about isolated credibility issues, Martin connected these investigative omissions to the possibility that law enforcement's approach was flawed and incomplete. This cross-examination exposed the jury to the weaknesses in the state's case that Martin contends should now entitle him to Confrontation Clause relief. Although Martin could not frame questions around the procedural history, prior court findings, or formal characterizations of *Brady* violations, the record indicates that his counsel elicited the substantive facts necessary for the jury to assess investigative bias and witness reliability. See *United States v. Maxwell*, 579 F.3d 1282, 1296–97 (11th Cir. 2009) (“The Sixth Amendment does not require unlimited inquiry into the potential bias of a witness.” (citation modified)).

The state, of course, chose not to call Calhoun as a witness. Martin could have called Calhoun as a witness, but the trial judge cautioned that he would not limit Calhoun's testimony to matters within the scope of Martin's direct examination. We conclude that the absence of this limitation did not violate Martin's rights.

Under de novo review, we conclude that the preclusion order did not deprive Martin of an opportunity to meaningfully confront the state's witnesses and that the requirements of the Confrontation Clause were satisfied. *Whyte*, 928 F.3d at 1334. We cannot say that a reasonable jury would have reached a significantly different impression of Scheer's credibility absent the order. Therefore, we affirm the district court's ruling that Martin's confrontation claim fails on the merits.

C. Complete Defense

1. AEDPA Deference Applies

Martin maintains that the ACCA failed to consider his complete defense claim on the merits. Unlike Martin's confrontation claim, the ACCA discussed Martin's ability to present his defense by introducing at the second trial the evidence that had been suppressed. And at that trial, the trial court allowed prior statements contained in affidavits and previous witness testimony. Thus, we presume that Martin's complete defense claim was adjudicated on the merits, even though the ACCA did not cite any federal law. See *Johnson*, 568 U.S. at 301. We will therefore review Martin's complete defense claim under AEDPA's deferential standard.

2. Merits

Martin argues that the ACCA's rejection of his complete defense claim was contrary to the Supreme Court's decisions in *Crane v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 683 (1986), *Van Arsdall*, and *United States v. Scheffer*, 523 U.S. 303 (1998). Martin argues that he was unable to

provide a complete defense because the preclusion order prevented him from eliciting testimony about how the state's misconduct and suppression of evidence led to (1) the inability of investigators to trace the call implicating Williams, (2) the inability of Martin or the state to pursue the man Broach observed, and (3) the inability of Martin to call some witnesses because they had died, and to question several witnesses effectively because they could not remember important facts.

"[T]he Constitution guarantees criminal defendants 'a meaningful opportunity to present a complete defense.'" *Crane*, 476 U.S. at 690 (quoting *California v. Trombetta*, 467 U.S. 479, 485 (1984)). But "well-established rules of evidence permit trial judges to exclude evidence if its probative value is outweighed by certain other factors such as unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or potential to mislead the jury." *Holmes v. South Carolina*, 547 U.S. 319, 326 (2006).

Despite the serious nature of the state's misconduct, none of the Supreme Court decisions Martin cites clearly establish a constitutional right to inform the jury that the state suppressed evidence in a prior proceeding. *Davis*, 120 F.4th at 788. In *Crane*, the Supreme Court held that a defendant may introduce evidence concerning the circumstances of a confession to challenge its reliability. 476 U.S. at 690–91. In *Van Arsdall*, the Supreme Court addressed limits on cross-examination designed to expose bias. 475 U.S. at 678–79. And in *Scheffer*, the Supreme Court rejected a "complete defense" challenge to a per se rule excluding polygraph evidence, holding

that the exclusion did not violate the Sixth Amendment because the defendant remained free to present his version of events and to challenge the prosecution's case through other admissible evidence, as is the case here. 523 U.S. at 317.

As we discussed in Part III.B.2, at his second trial, Martin introduced the previously suppressed evidence and was able to question the officers about their botched investigation. We must be mindful that “a defendant’s right to present a complete defense is not absolute, and is subject to reasonable restrictions.” *United States v. Mitrovic*, 890 F.3d 1217, 1221 (11th Cir. 2018). Here, the trial judge implemented reasonable restrictions to prevent the trial from focusing on prosecutorial misconduct rather than the evidence of Martin’s innocence or guilt.

Additionally, “if the court permits a defendant to present the essence of his desired argument to the jury, his right to present a complete defense has not been prejudiced.” *United States v. Harris*, 916 F.3d 948, 959 (11th Cir. 2019). The trial court permitted Martin to present evidence bearing on the investigators’ failure to pursue leads and alternative suspects. Therefore, we conclude that the ACCA’s rejection of Martin’s complete defense claim was neither contrary to nor involved an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law.

D. Sufficiency of the Evidence

Martin does not dispute that the ACCA adjudicated his sufficiency claim on the merits. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees “that no person shall be made to

suffer the onus of a criminal conviction except upon sufficient proof—defined as evidence necessary to convince a trier of fact beyond a reasonable doubt of the existence of every element of the offense.” *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 316 (1979).

Unlike his other claims, Martin challenges the ACCA’s ruling on his sufficiency of the evidence claim under § 2254(d)(1) and (d)(2). Martin argues that under § 2254(d)(1), the ACCA unreasonably applied the *Jackson* standard to the facts of his case because no fairminded jurist could agree with the ACCA’s conclusion that the state presented sufficient evidence that Martin killed his wife for pecuniary gain. Martin further argues that under § 2254(d)(2), the ACCA’s factual determination that the state presented evidence that, viewed in its favor, was sufficient to establish a prima facie case of capital murder for pecuniary gain was unreasonable in light of the evidence presented during his second trial. The state maintains that the circumstantial evidence it elicited at trial directly or indirectly supported that Martin murdered his wife for pecuniary gain.

We “look to state law for the substantive elements of the criminal offense.” *Preston v. Sec’y, Fla. Dep’t of Corr.*, 785 F.3d 449, 464 (11th Cir. 2015) (citation modified). To convict Martin of capital murder for pecuniary gain, the jury had to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Martin, with the intent to cause the death of another person, caused the death of another person for pecuniary gain or other valuable consideration. Ala. Code §§ 13A-5-40(a)(7),

13A-6-2(a)(1) (1975). “In order to apply the aggravating circumstance of [capital murder] for pecuniary gain, it is clear that the receipt of something of pecuniary value must be the *impetus* for the murder.” *Henderson v. State*, 584 So. 2d 841, 858 (Ala. Crim. App. 1988) (emphasis added) (citation modified).

The ACCA concluded that the state presented sufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of murder for pecuniary gain based on the following: (1) evidence that the scene was staged to look like an accident, (2) Martin prepared an accident report that was similar to an accident that occurred a year prior, (3) Martin and Hammoleketh had marital problems, (4) Martin was the last known person to see Hammoleketh alive, (5) Taylor testified that he saw a trooper in the area, and (6) when asked by police during the investigation, Martin did not disclose all of Hammoleketh’s life insurance policies. We address Martin’s § 2254(d)(2) challenge first.

1. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2)

The evidence of pecuniary gain is weak. The ACCA made only one finding that bears on whether Martin received life insurance proceeds: the impetus of the murder was “life-insurance policies” Martin held on Hammoleketh and failed to disclose, particularly “[o]ne large policy [that] would pay in the event that Hammoleketh was killed in a vehicular accident.” To support its finding, the ACCA determined that the state offered evidence that supported “*Martin* held a policy insuring the life of Hammoleketh for \$150,000; this amount was collectible only if Hammoleketh died in a passenger vehicle.” (emphasis added). Besides that policy, the

ACCA maintained “[t]here were also various other insurance policies for minor amounts.” As Martin points out, the ACCA’s factual findings directly bearing on pecuniary gain are not supported by the record.

First, the \$150,000 policy the ACCA referenced is not a life insurance policy. It is an accidental death and dismemberment insurance policy. This distinction matters. Scheer testified that he *specifically* asked Martin to bring him “all of the life insurance that he had on Hammoleketh.” The state did not dispute that Martin disclosed a \$200,000 life insurance policy he had on Hammoleketh and a policy he had on himself. Scheer testified that he did not ask Martin about accidental death insurance policies.

Second, the record does not support that the state presented evidence that Martin *held* that \$150,000 policy on Hammoleketh. The policy’s enrollment form is signed by Hammoleketh. And during a sidebar, the state conceded to the trial judge, “[A]s far as any arguments about who took out the policy, we understand that Mrs. Martin may be the one who actually purchased the policy. . . .”

Third, the accidental death policy never came into evidence during the second trial. The parties argued over admission of the policy at a sidebar on a Friday toward the end of the state’s presentation of evidence. During the sidebar, the state said that it needed the judge to rule on the admissibility of the policy so its financial expert could prepare a summary or demonstrative to show the jury that following Monday, if the judge determined there was no authentication problem. The judge told the state to assume the policy

would be admitted so it could provide the defense with a copy of whatever the witness was preparing, and he would decide admissibility on Monday.

When court resumed on Monday, the state rested without calling its financial expert. Despite lacking proper authentication and a witness, the state maintained during sidebar in Martin’s case-in-chief that “[t]he mere existence of the [\$150,000] policy is the only thing that is [relevant] to the [s]tate’s case in chief at this time.” Throughout the trial, the trial judge gave several reasons why the policy would not be admitted. First, the state’s custodian-of-record affidavit, certifying the policy was a duplicate of the original, did not comply with Alabama’s evidentiary rules because several policy pages were missing. Second, the state had no witness to authenticate the policy. Third, even if the state had properly authenticated the policy, it had no witness to explain what the policy language meant, and the trial judge determined that it would be confusing to simply give the jury a copy of the policy to figure it out themselves.

Since the state never admitted the accidental death policy into evidence and it presented no witness to support the capital part of its case, we conclude that Martin has presented clear and convincing evidence to overcome our presumption that the ACCA’s factual determinations regarding pecuniary gain are correct under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1). *Pye*, 50 F.4th at 1035.

Nonetheless, even though Martin has met his burden under § 2254(e)(1), the ACCA’s ultimate decision to reject Martin’s sufficiency of the evidence claim may still be based on a “reasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the [s]tate court proceeding.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2). AEDPA requires us to look at all the evidence presented in the state court proceeding, not just the evidence the state presented. *Id.* At trial, the state presented testimony that Martin was aware of and disclosed to Scheer a \$200,000 policy that insured Hammoleketh’s life. Martin then presented testimony from his insurance expert that (1) the \$200,000 policy was an increase from the \$85,000 life insurance policy that Hammoleketh lost when she stopped working at her job in March 1995, (2) the Martins had a lot of credit card debt but were making their payments, and (3) the Martins had taken out a second mortgage to pay down debt.

As we said, the state’s evidence on pecuniary gain is weak. After the state withdrew its financial expert and failed to introduce the purportedly undisclosed accidental death policy into evidence, Martin tried to affirmatively negate that the state had met its burden to prove murder for pecuniary gain. In doing so, he supplied the jury with unfavorable evidence and gave the state an opportunity to introduce additional evidence of pecuniary motive. The jury was not required to credit how Martin’s witnesses characterized his financial circumstances. Viewing this evidence in conjunction with the non-pecuniary evidence that the ACCA identified, we cannot say that the ACCA made an unreasonable determination of the facts under § 2254(d)(2).

2. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1)

To prevail on a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, a petitioner must prove that “after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, [no] rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.” *Jackson*, 443 U.S. at 319. But “[w]hen the record reflects facts that support conflicting inferences, there is a presumption that the jury resolved those conflicts in favor of the prosecution and against the defendant.” *Johnson v. Alabama*, 256 F.3d 1156, 1172 (11th Cir. 2001).

AEDPA does not require overwhelming evidence of guilt. “[W]hen the last state court to decide a prisoner’s federal claim explains its decision on the merits in a reasoned opinion . . . a federal habeas court simply reviews the specific reasons given by the state court and defers to those reasons if they are reasonable.” *Wilson v. Sellers*, 584 U.S. 122, 125 (2018). However, in determining whether an unreasonable application of *Jackson* occurred “we are not limited by the particular justifications the state court provided for its decision, and we may consider additional rationales that support the state court’s determination.” *Davis*, 120 F.4th at 788. Thus, viewing the evidence presented in the light most favorable to the prosecution, as discussed in Part III.D.1, we cannot say that *no* rational trier of fact could have found that Martin killed his wife for pecuniary gain. *Jackson*, 443 U.S. at 319. Therefore, we conclude that the ACCA’s rejection of Martin’s sufficiency of the evidence claim was neither contrary to nor involved an unreasonable application of

24-11986

Opinion of the Court

41

Jackson under § 2254(d)(1), and was not based on an unreasonable determination of the facts under § 2254(d)(2).

IV. CONCLUSION

The district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**.