

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

BASIL JARJUS AKRAWI,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

November 14, 1997

No. 191805

Recorder's Court

LC No. 94-012493-FH

Before: Griffin, P.J., and Sawyer and O'Connell, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right from his convictions by bench trial for receiving and concealing stolen property valued at more than \$100, MCL 750.535; MSA 28.803, and conspiracy, MCL 750.157a; MSA 28.354(1). We affirm.

Defendant was accused of owning a resale store which concealed stolen goods, having stolen property in his home, and conspiring to conceal stolen property with his codefendant, who was accused of managing the store. Defendant argued that there was insufficient evidence to support a conviction on either charge. Defendant's motion for a directed verdict of acquittal was denied, and the trial court convicted him of both counts. Defendant was sentenced to two concurrent terms of one to five years' imprisonment. This appeal followed.

Defendant first argues that there was insufficient evidence to support his conviction for receiving and concealing stolen property. We disagree. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, there was sufficient evidence to allow a rational trier of fact to find that the property, which was recovered from defendant's home pursuant to a search warrant, was stolen. See *People v Hampton*, 407 Mich 354, 368; 285 NW2d 284 (1979); *People v Wolfe*, 440 Mich 508, 513-516; 489 NW2d 748 (1992), modified on other grounds 441 Mich 1201; 490 NW2d 408 (1992). There was evidence that a television and a video cassette recorder were returned to their rightful owner and that defendant had purchased the television on the street for \$150 despite his suspicion that it was stolen. It was possible to infer that these goods were stolen from the evidence that was presented and

such a reasonable inference constituted satisfactory proof of defendant's guilt. See *People v Truong (After Remand)*, 218 Mich App 325, 337; 553 NW2d 692 (1996).

Defendant also argues that there was insufficient evidence to support his conviction for conspiracy. We disagree. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, there was sufficient evidence to allow a rational trier of fact to find that defendant acted in concert with his codefendant to conspire to receive and conceal stolen goods. See *Hampton, supra*; *Wolfe, supra*. Defendant's admission that he knowingly rented space to a store which he believed to be operated illegally suggests that defendant had, at a minimum, an implied agreement with his codefendant to permit the shop to receive and conceal stolen property. Further, there was some evidence that defendant was present at the shop during an illegal transaction and transported stolen property from the shop to his garage. This evidence is consistent with the results of the search warrant executed at defendant's home which revealed the presence of stolen property. These circumstances constituted sufficient evidence from which a rational trier of fact could infer an intent to combine with his codefendant to conspire to receive and conceal stolen property. See *People v Carter*, 415 Mich 558, 567-568; 330 NW2d 314 (1982).

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell