

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

JOHN H. BROWN,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

June 6, 2000

No. 212869

Wayne Circuit Court

Criminal Division

LC No. 97-000528

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr. and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right from his conviction of receiving or concealing stolen property, MCL 750.535; MSA 28.803, entered after a jury trial. We affirm.

At trial, the evidence showed that defendant and a co-defendant were found in possession of a stolen car. Defendant was observed steering the car while his co-defendant pushed it with a van. The interior of the car had been stripped. Defendant possessed a sharpened crowbar which had made scratch marks on the car's driver's door near the lock. Complainant testified that at the time it was stolen, the fair market value of the car exceeded \$100. She received \$3000 in insurance benefits. An insurance adjuster opined that the value of the stripped car exceeded \$100. The jury found defendant guilty as charged.

In reviewing a sufficiency of the evidence question, we view the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution to determine whether a rational trier of fact could conclude that the elements of the offense were proven beyond a reasonable doubt. *People v Wolfe*, 440 Mich 508, 514-515; 489 NW2d 748, amended 441 Mich 1201 (1992). We do not interfere with the jury's role of determining the weight of the evidence or the credibility of witnesses.; *People v Warren*, 228 Mich App 336, 343; 578 NW2d 692 (1998). A trier of fact may make reasonable inferences from evidence in the record, but may not make inferences completely unsupported by any direct or circumstantial evidence. *People v Vaughn*, 186 Mich App 376, 379-380; 465 NW2d 365 (1990).

The elements of receiving or concealing stolen property over \$100 are that: “(1) the property was stolen; (2) the property has a fair market value of over \$100; (3) the defendant bought, received, possessed, or concealed the property with knowledge that the property was stolen; and (4) the property was identified as being previously stolen.” *People v Gow*, 203 Mich App 94, 96; 512 NW2d 34 (1993).

Defendant argues that his conviction must be reversed because insufficient evidence was produced to establish the fair market value of the car at the time he was found to be in possession of it. We disagree and affirm. Defendant was found in possession of the car one day after it was reported stolen. A crowbar possessed by defendant had a sharpened end which matched scratch marks near the driver’s door lock. Complainant testified regarding the value of the car being over \$100 at the time it was stolen. From this evidence, the jury could infer that defendant stole the car and could conclude that the value of the car exceeded \$100. Viewed in a light most favorable to the prosecution, the evidence was sufficient to support defendant’s conviction. *Wolfe, supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra