IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION II

STATE OF WASHINGTON, Respondent, v. PATRICK C. ADAMS, Appellant.	No. 38653-4-II UNPUBLISHED OPINION

Armstrong, J. — Patrick C. Adams appeals his conviction for possession of a stolen motor vehicle, arguing that the State failed to prove he knew the car was stolen, a necessary element of the crime. Because the circumstantial evidence is sufficient to support the conviction, we affirm.

FACTS

In the early morning of June 14, 2008, Patrick Adams stopped at a convenience store to buy gas. While Adams was filling his vehicle with gas, Deputy Paul McHugh happened to drive by and ran a routine computer check of the vehicle's license plates. McHugh learned that the vehicle was reported stolen and entered the convenience store parking lot. When McHugh approached the vehicle, Adams was no longer in sight. McHugh talked with a female passenger in the car, explaining that the vehicle was stolen. The woman told McHugh that Adams was giving her a ride home from a friend's house. And when Adams saw McHugh's

police car, he ran into the convenience store.

McHugh found Adams in the convenience store hiding above coolers and arrested him on outstanding warrants. After waiving his *Miranda*[1] rights, Adams told McHugh that he had met a girl at a house party and taken a car from the party to give her a ride home. Adams could not recall the exact location of the party or the full name of the party's host. Adams provided McHugh with only a general idea of where the party was hosted. McHugh offered Adams the chance to take him to the party site so he could question the vehicle's owner, but Adams declined.

McHugh found no key to the vehicle either in the car or on Adams; he testified that the ignition area on the steering column of the car appeared damaged.

ANALYSIS

Adams argues that the State failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he *knew* the vehicle was stolen at the time he was arrested. We disagree.

I. Standard of Review

Evidence is sufficient to support a criminal conviction when any trier of fact could have found the defendant guilty. *State v. Salinas*, 119 Wn.2d 192, 201, 829 P.2d 1068 (1992). When considering a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, we view the evidence in the light most favorable to the State. *Salinas*, 119 Wn.2d at 201. In other words, a defendant who challenges the sufficiency of the evidence, "admits the truth of the State's evidence and all inferences that reasonably can be drawn therefrom." *State v. Thomas*, 150 Wn.2d 821, 874, 83 P.3d 970 (2004) (quoting *Salinas*, 119 Wn.2d at 201).

The jury can infer the necessary criminal knowledge where the defendant's conduct plainly

[1] *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602, 16 L. Ed. 2d 694 (1966).

indicates it as logically probable. *State v. Delmarter*, 94 Wn.2d 634, 638, 618 P.2d 99 (1980). A person is guilty of possessing stolen property when he possesses the property and withholds it from the person entitled to possession, "knowing that it has been stolen." RCW 9A.56.140(1).

II. Sufficient Evidence of Knowledge

A defendant has knowledge when he is either directly aware of a fact or has information that would lead a reasonable person in the same situation to conclude the fact exists. RCW 9A.08.010(1)(b). As stated above, a jury may infer knowledge when the defendant's conduct makes it "logically probable" that he possessed the requisite knowledge. *Delmarter*, 94 Wn.2d at 638. Although evidence that the defendant merely possessed a stolen vehicle is insufficient, slight corroborative evidence tending to show guilt is sufficient. *See State v. Ladely*, 82 Wn.2d 172, 175, 509 P.2d 658 (1973) (evidence showing the defendant possessed stolen property combined with an improbable explanation of the reason for possession was sufficient to uphold a conviction of grand larceny).

Here, Adams ran and hid when he saw McHugh's police car pull into the parking lot. When McHugh asked him to explain his possession of the car, Adams related a story that McHugh could not verify; Adams could not tell him where the party was or the full name of the party's host. And when McHugh offered to let Adams direct him back to the party, Adams declined the offer. Adams did not have a key to the car and none was in the ignition. Finally, McHugh observed damage to the ignition area on the vehicle's steering column.

This circumstantial evidence is more than sufficient to prove Adams's guilty knowledge.

Affirmed.

A majority of the panel having determined that this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but will be filed for public record pursuant to RCW 2.06.040, it is so ordered.

Armstrong, J.

We concur:

Bridgewater, P.J.

Quinn-Brintnall, J.