FILED
JAN 26 1983
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

STATE OF IOWA,	)	
Appellee,	)	Filed January 26, 1983
vs.	)	2-410 67367
ROBERT E. HICKS,	)	
Appellant.	)	

Appeal from Black Hawk District Court, Leonard D. Lybbert, Judge.

The defendant appeals his conviction of burglary in the second degree in violation of Iowa Code sections 713.1, .3 (1979). AFFIRMED.

K. L. Kober, Waterloo, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Mary Jane Blink, Assistant Attorney General, and David H. Correll, County Attorney, for appellee.

Considered en banc.

PER CURIAM

Defendant appeals from his conviction of burglary in the second degree in violation of Iowa Code sections 713.1, .3 (1979). The defendant raises three issues. We affirm.

The defendant argues that there was insufficient evidence for the jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed burglary in the second degree and thus that the trial court erred in overruling his motions for judgment of acquittal and for new trial based on such insufficiency. After review of the record according to standards as set forth in State v. Aldape, 307 N.W.2d 32, 39 (Iowa 1981), and State v. Schrier, 300 N.W.2d 305, 306-08 (Iowa 1981), we determine that the submitted evidence, particularly the testimony of the witnesses at the scene of the crime and the arresting officers, was sufficient to support the jury's finding that the defendant committed the burglary.

As to his second and third issues, the defendant claims respectively that the trial court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial based on the jury's alleged prejudicial misconduct in considering their personal experiences regarding breaking glass and that the trial court erred in sustaining at a posttrial hearing the State's objections to questions concerning such considerations by the jury. These jury considerations did not constitute prejudicial jury misconduct. We find that the jurors can take their life experiences, including those involving breaking glass, with them to the jury room. See State v. Manning, 224 N.W.2d 232, 236 (Iowa 1974). Assuming without deciding that the trial court erred in sustaining the objections to questions concerning such jury considerations, such error was harmless since the conduct as revealed by the offers of proof was not prejudicial.

The judgment is therefore affirmed.

AFFIRMED.