FILED
JAN 31 1978
CLERK SUPREME COURT

87

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

STATE OF IOWA,	)	Filed January 31, 1978
Appellee,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
GERALDINE RAE ASHLEY,	)	379
	)	60353
Appellant.	)	60354

Appeal from Polk District Court - J. P. Denato, Judge.

Defendant appeals her guilty plea convictions of delivery and conspiracy to deliver controlled substances, asserting that she should have been permitted to withdraw such pleas. Affirmed.

Thomas J. Reilly, of Des Moines, for appellant.

Richard C. Turner, Attorney General, and Dan L. Johnston, Polk County Attorney, for appellee.

Submitted to Allbee, C.J., and Donielson, Snell, Oxberger and Carter, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Geraldine Rae Ashley appeals from her convictions for delivery of a controlled substance and conspiracy to deliver controlled substances, all in violation of § 204.401(1), The Code. Her convictions were based upon pleas of guilty pursuant to a bargain in which the State dismissed five of eight pending charges and recommended concurrent sentencing.

Defendant's first attacks upon trial court's acceptance of, and subsequent refusal to permit withdrawal of, her pleas are based upon the fact that she was not informed of the availability of, nor did she have, an accommodation hearing. These complaints are without merit. First, as part of the plea bargain, defendant waived any right to an accommodation hearing. (X. 10.) Second, the supreme court has specifically ruled that a defendant need not be informed of the availability of an accommodation hearing when entering a guilty plea. State v. Barrett, 250 N.W.2d 31 (Iowa 1977). Finally, defendant's statements, both at the taking of the plea (X. 6-8.), and at sentencing (X. 23, 24.), demonstrated that the deliveries were for profit. Resolution of that issue is the only purpose for an accommodation hearing.

Defendant next complains of trial court's refusal to accept her offer of proof at the sentencing hearing. While trial court may have been better advised to permit the offer of proof, failure to do so did not in this instance prejudice the defendant. She was allowed to explain her understanding of the plea taking proceeding in some detail. Trial court found nothing in her story which suggested a need for further exploration of the events surrounding the earlier hearing. We have been provided with sufficient information to confidently conclude that defendant's complaint has no basis.

Finally, defendant raises two objections specifically directed to her plea on the conspiracy count. She first suggests that she did not know that her confederate intended to deliver drugs for profit. This is contrary to the information provided trial court at the plea hearing. (X. 6-8.) The same portion of the record shows that defendant admitted to the intent necessary to the conspiracy charges, contrary to the untimely assertion first made in her reply brief. We have reviewed all of defendant's assignments of error, and find each to be without merit.

AFFIRMED.