

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

KENNETH LEON LITTLEJOHN,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 19, 1998

No. 192673

Recorder's Court

LC No. 95-005354

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

LESLIE BERNARD LITTLEJOHN,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

No. 192674

Recorder's Court

LC No. 95-005354

Before: McDonald, P.J., and Saad and Smolenski, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendants were convicted by a jury of armed robbery, MCL 750.529; MSA 28.797. Defendant Kenneth Littlejohn was sentenced to a term of six to fifteen years' imprisonment and defendant Leslie Littlejohn was sentenced to a term of five to fifteen years' imprisonment. Defendants appeal as of right. We affirm.

Viewing all the facts and circumstances, including the reasonable inferences arising therefrom, in a light most favorable to the prosecution, we conclude that a rational factfinder could have found beyond a reasonable doubt that some person or persons committed the crime of armed robbery, that defendants performed acts or gave encouragement that assisted the commission of this crime, and that

defendants intended to commit armed robbery or knew that the principal or principals intended to commit armed robbery at the time defendants gave their aid and

encouragement. *People v Johnson*, 215 Mich App 658, 671; 547 NW2d 65 (1996); *People v Sean Jones (On Rehearing)*, 201 Mich App 449, 451; 506 NW2d 542 (1993). The evidence was sufficient to support defendants' convictions and the trial court, therefore, did not err in denying defendants' post-trial motions for a directed verdict of acquittal. See MCR 6.431(D); *People v Lemmon*, 456 Mich 625, 633-634; 576 NW2d 129 (1998).

Viewing the jury instructions in their entirety, we find no error because the jury was adequately instructed on intent necessary to be convicted of armed robbery as an aider and abettor. *People v Davis*, 216 Mich App 47, 54; 549 NW2d 1 (1996).

Finally, in denying defendants' motion for a new trial, the trial court reasoned that ascertaining whether defendants were guilty of armed robbery was a matter properly left to the jury. We find no abuse of discretion in this ruling. *People v Plummer*, \_\_\_ Mich App \_\_\_; \_\_\_ NW2d \_\_\_ (Docket No. 199770, issued 4/10/98), slip op p 6-7.

Affirmed.

/s/ Gary R. McDonald  
/s/ Henry William Saad  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski