

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS
NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION
KAREN R. BAKER, JUDGE

DIVISION III

CACR07-512

JOSEPH STRATION PARKER

FEBRUARY 20, 2008

v.
STATE OF ARKANSAS

APPELLANT

APPEAL FROM THE LOGAN COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT
[NO. CR2003-8]

APPELLEE

HONORABLE TERRY M. SULLIVAN,
CIRCUIT JUDGE

AFFIRMED

Appellant Joseph Parker was charged in Logan County Circuit Court with three counts of rape. Appellant represented himself at trial and was convicted and sentenced to sixty years in the Arkansas Department of Correction. In *Parker v. State*, 93 Ark. App. 472, 220 S.W.3d 238 (2005), this court reversed his conviction holding that while the trial court explained that the appellant would be held to the same standards as an attorney, “there must still be a specific warning of the substantive dangers of *pro se* representation in each case.” *Id.*

On retrial, appellant was specifically warned of the substantive dangers of *pro se* representation; however, he nevertheless waived his right to counsel and chose to represent himself a second time. Appellant was convicted on virtually identical testimony that was adduced at the first trial. He was sentenced to seventy-five years in the Arkansas Department of Correction.

His sole argument on appeal is that the trial court erred in denying his motion for a directed verdict. While appellant did move for a directed verdict, his motions merely asked for a directed verdict, failing to identify in what respect the evidence was insufficient. *See* Ark. R. Crim. P. 33.1 (2006). A general motion that merely asserts that the State has failed to prove its case is inadequate to preserve the issue for appeal. *Carey v. State*, 365 Ark. 379, 230 S.W.3d 553 (2006). The reason underlying the requirement that specific grounds be stated and that the absent proof be pinpointed is that it allows the circuit court the option of either granting the motion, or, if justice requires, of allowing the State to reopen its case and supply the missing proof. *Id.*

Appellant's motion was general in nature and failed to specify the respect in which the evidence was insufficient. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in denying appellant's motions for directed verdict.

Affirmed.

GRIFFEN and VAUGHT, JJ., agree.