

*This opinion is nonprecedential except as provided by
Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A25-0333**

State of Minnesota,
Respondent

vs.

Bradley Martin Woida,
Appellant.

**Filed December 22, 2025
Affirmed
Kirk, Judge***

Waseca County District Court
File No. 81-CR-24-215

Keith Ellison, Attorney General, St. Paul, Minnesota; and

Rachel V. Cornelius, Waseca County Attorney, Waseca, Minnesota (for respondent)

Cathryn Middlebrook, Chief Appellate Public Defender, Adam Lozeau, Assistant Public
Defender, St. Paul, Minnesota (for appellant)

Considered and decided by Reyes, Presiding Judge; Wheelock, Judge; and Kirk,
Judge.

* Retired judge of the Minnesota Court of Appeals, serving by appointment pursuant to
Minn. Const. art. VI, § 10.

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION

KIRK, Judge

Appellant challenges his conviction of failing to register as a predatory offender, arguing that the district court erred by admitting evidence that violated his rights under the Confrontation Clause and contained inadmissible hearsay under the Minnesota Rules of Evidence. We affirm.

FACTS

In late March 2024, appellant, Bradley Martin Woida, entered the Waseca County Sheriff's Office to update his predatory-offender registration. Woida told officers that he had moved to Waseca on February 5, 2024, and that he had updated his registration on that day. Woida explained that he returned because he had learned at a recent court appearance that the February 5 registration "didn't get filed in." Officers reviewed security-camera footage and documentary records from February 5 and found no evidence that Woida had visited the sheriff's office on that date. Finding that Woida had been living in Waseca for over a month without having updated his registration, officers arrested Woida.

Respondent State of Minnesota charged Woida with one count of failure to fulfill his predatory-offender registration requirement in violation of Minn. Stat. § 243.166, subd. 5(a)(1) (2022). Woida pleaded not guilty to the charge, waived his right to a jury trial, and requested a court trial.

At the September 2024 court trial, the state called two officers and Woida's probation officer. The state also offered two exhibits: a body-worn-camera video from the officers' interaction with Woida and Woida's predatory offender packet that the officers

had received from the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA). Woida waived his right to testify and called no additional witnesses.

Woida objected to admission of the predatory offender packet on hearsay, authentication, and Confrontation Clause grounds. In particular, Woida took issue with a partial copy of his original predatory offender registration form that listed his original conviction. He argued that it was not self-authenticating and contained testimonial out-of-court statements by a BCA official. The district court received the exhibit over Woida's objection.

Prior to closing arguments, Woida moved for acquittal, arguing that the state failed to prove that he was a person required to register. The district court denied the motion, finding that—even excluding the disputed evidence—there was sufficient evidence establishing that Woida was required to register. Specifically, the district court relied on the probation officer's testimony that she had frequently spoken to Woida about his registration requirements since May of 2023, and the body-worn-camera video showing Woida admitting to officers that he was required to register.

The district court found Woida guilty and sentenced him to 30 months' imprisonment. Woida appeals.

DECISION

Woida argues that the district court erred because admission of the registration form violated his rights under the Confrontation Clause and contained inadmissible hearsay under the Minnesota Rules of Evidence. We affirm because, even if the district court erred, any error was harmless.

This court applies an abuse-of-discretion standard of review to a district court’s ruling on a hearsay objection. *Olson ex rel. A.C.O. v. Olson*, 892 N.W.2d 837, 841 (Minn. App. 2017). “When an error does not implicate a constitutional right, we ask whether ‘there is a reasonable possibility that the wrongfully admitted evidence significantly affected the verdict.’” *State v. McNeilly*, 6 N.W.3d 161, 189 (Minn. 2024) (quoting *State v. Cram*, 718 N.W.2d 898, 904 n.1 (Minn. 2006)). When an error implicates a constitutional right, appellate courts ask whether the error was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. *Id.* “For an error to be harmless beyond a reasonable doubt, the guilty verdict . . . must be surely unattributable to the error.” *State v. Shoen*, 598 N.W.2d 370, 377 (Minn. 1999) (quotations omitted). When determining whether a verdict was surely unattributable to an erroneous admission of evidence, appellate courts “consider the manner in which the evidence was presented, whether it was highly persuasive, whether it was used in closing argument, and whether it was effectively countered by the defendant.” *State v. Sanders*, 775 N.W.2d 883, 888 (Minn. 2009) (quotation omitted). If the error implicating a constitutional right was not harmless beyond a reasonable doubt, then appellate courts “will award a new trial.” *State v. Lee*, 929 N.W.2d 432, 440 (Minn. 2019) (quotation omitted).

We need not decide whether admission of the registration form violated Woida’s rights under the Confrontation Clause or contained inadmissible hearsay because any error was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt.

Woida contends that any error cannot be harmless because the district court relied on the registration form in its order. But in its order, the district court disclaimed reliance on the registration form, stating that it “gives greater weight to the evidence contained in [the body-worn-camera video] wherein the Defendant acknowledges his requirement to register as a predatory offender on or about March 20, 2024.” Additionally, even at trial, the district court declined to give any weight to the registration form when denying Woida’s motion for acquittal. Instead, the court relied on the probation officer’s testimony that she reminded Woida to register, and the body-worn-camera video showing Woida admitting to officers that he was required to register. Therefore, any error in admitting the form was harmless because the district court assigned the disputed evidence no persuasive value.

Woida further contends that the error cannot be harmless because the conviction could not be established absent the disputed evidence. But, as the district court stated, “it is undisputed that the Defendant was required to register as a predatory offender as of March 20, 2024, the date of the alleged violation of the registration requirements, based on Defendant’s statements made to the officers in [the body-worn-camera video] acknowledging his requirement to register as a predatory offender.” And this conclusion is supported by the record. The body-worn-camera video shows an officer asking Woida, “You know part of your requirements are to register within five days of where you move to?” The body-worn-camera video shows Woida responding, “Yes.”

Therefore, because the district court’s guilty verdict was based entirely on evidence independent of the challenged evidence, any constitutional error was harmless beyond a

reasonable doubt. *See Shoen*, 598 N.W.2d at 377. Accordingly, any evidentiary error was also harmless because—since the district court did not rely upon it—there is no “reasonable possibility that the [disputed] evidence significantly affected the verdict.” *See, McNeilly*, 6 N.W.3d at 189 (quotation omitted).

Affirmed.