IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

FILED
AUG 29 1985
CLERK SUPREME COURT
Filed August 29, 1985

STATE OF IOWA,	)	491
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	
vs.	)	5-399 84-1930
RAYMOND EDWARD MORRIS,	)	
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County - Ray A. Fenton, Judge.

Defendant appeals from his conviction of second-degree robbery asserting that there was insufficient evidence in the record from which the jury could conclude that he was guilty of aiding and abetting. AFFIRMED.

Charles Harrington, Appellate Defender, and B. John Burns, Assistant Appellate Defender, for defendant-appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and David L. Dorff, Assistant Attorney General, for plaintiff-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., and Snell, and Sackett, JJ.

SACKETT, J.

Defendant appeals from his conviction of second-degree robbery in violation of Iowa Code sections 711.1 and 711.3. Defendant asserts that there was insufficient evidence in the record from which the jury could conclude that he was guilty of aiding and abetting a robbery.

In determining sufficiency of the evidence, we view the evidence in the light most favorable to the state. State v. Wilkins, 346 N.W.2d 16, 20 (Iowa 1984). All inferences that are fairly and reasonably deducted from the evidence are accepted, and all the evidence, not just that supporting the verdict, is considered. Id. The verdict will be upheld if supported by "substantial evidence," which is evidence that would convince a rational trier of fact that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Id.

Defendant contends that the only evidence of his involvement with the robbery was the fact that he was carrying a large amount of cash on his person at the time of his arrest. Defendant argues that his possession of a large sum of money at the time of arrest is insufficient to convict him of aiding and abetting the robbery even if the money belonged to the victim.

One cannot be convicted of a crime upon a theory of aiding and abetting unless there is substantial evidence to show he assented to or lent countenance and approval to the criminal act either by active participation in it or by some manner encouraging it prior to or at the time of its commission. State v. Phams, 342 N.W.2d 792, 796 (Iowa 1983). Guilt may be established by circumstantial evidence. Id. Knowledge is essential, but neither knowledge nor presence at the scene of the crime is sufficient to prove aiding and abetting. Id. The underlying precept of aiding and abetting is a requirement that the accessory in some way associated himself with the venture, that he participated in it as something he wished to bring about, and that he sought by his action to make it succeed. Id.

The robbery victim testified that defendant and co-defendant walked by him while he was working in a fenced-in-area. The two men returned, and co-defendant pulled a knife demanding the victim's billfold and pocket change. During the course of the robbery, defendant stood on the other side of the fence looking in several times. After the victim relinquished his money, defendant and co-defendant fled on foot. The victim stated that he was carrying approximately $490 at the time of the robbery. Police spotted defendant and co-defendant a short time after the robbery. Defendant was found carrying $490 in bills when he was arrested.

Under the record before us, there is sufficient evidence of defendant's active participation in the robbery to support his conviction.

AFFIRMED.