FILED
AUG 30 1983
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

STATE OF IOWA,	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	Filed August 30, 1983
vs.	)	
BOBBY LEE DELANEY,	)	3-172/68649
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from Polk District Court - Gene L. Needles, Judge.

Defendant appeals his convictions of assault with intent to inflict serious injury in violation of Iowa Code § 708.2(1) and going armed with intent in violation of Iowa Code § 708.8. AFFIRMED.

Patrick R. Grady, Assistant Appellate Defender, for defendant-appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and Joseph P. Weeg, Assistant Attorney General, for plaintiff-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., and Donielson, Snell, Schlegel, and Hayden, JJ.

DONIELSON, J.

Defendant appeals his convictions of assault with intent to inflict serious injury in violation of Iowa Code § 708.2(1) and going armed with intent in violation of Iowa Code § 708.8. He claims that the trial court abused its discretion in preventing him from cross-examining one of the State's witnesses about her 1967 robbery conviction and her prior assaults. We affirm.

Defendant's convictions stemmed from an incident in which Lynda Lucas was stabbed. The State presented evidence that defendant had an argument with Edith Brown at her apartment. Brown left her apartment and went across the hall to Sam Bryant's apartment where Lucas was visiting at the time. Defendant followed Brown and began arguing with her in Bryant's apartment. Brown left and went to the landlord's apartment to call the police. Defendant went into Bryant's kitchen, took a knife, and left the apartment. Defendant returned, told Lucas that she was interfering with his relationship with Brown and stabbed Lucas. He then left the apartment building.

Edith Brown was a State witness. Prior to her testimony, defendant requested permission to impeach Brown with a 1968 robbery conviction. He argued that Brown did not lead a blameless life since her felony conviction, noting that she had been convicted in 1977 for assault with intent to do bodily injury. The trial court denied the request on the ground that the prior conviction was too remote.

Defendant also requested that he be allowed to cross-examine Brown as to the assault conviction and a subsequent alleged assault that was not prosecuted. He wanted to show "extremely violent tendencies on the part of the witness Edith Brown" and "a course of conduct on the part of Edith Brown showing that she's an extremely violent individual in the past, leading to the conclusion that she very well may have stabbed Lynda Lucas." In response to the prosecutor's comment

concerning the lack of relevancy regarding the fact that Brown may be a violent individual, the defense counsel responded that it was defendant's position that Brown was lying and that she was "handy with a knife." The trial court denied defendant's request on the basis that the prior assaults were not relevant.

Defendant was tried by a jury and was convicted of the offenses charged. He filed a motion for new trial alleging that the court erred in disallowing his cross-examination of Edith Brown regarding her prior robbery conviction and "violent tendencies." The motion was overruled and this appeal followed.

I.

Defendant first claims he should have been allowed to cross-examine Brown about her 1968 robbery conviction in order to impeach her credibility. In determining whether a prior felony conviction may be admitted to impeach a witness, the age of such conviction is one factor to be considered. State v. Martin, 217 N.W.2d 536, 542 (Iowa 1974). A trial court's decision on such a matter will not be overruled absent an abuse of discretion. See State v. Cuevas, 282 N.W.2d 74, 81 (Iowa 1979). We do not believe the court abused its discretion here in finding that Brown's fourteen-year-old conviction was too remote to allow it to be used to impeach her credibility. Nor was the court bound to allow defendant to refer to the conviction merely because Brown was subsequently convicted of another offense. State v. Thompkins, 318 N.W.2d 194, 199 (Iowa 1982). This issue has no merit.

II.

Defendant also claims he should have been allowed to cross-examine Brown about her past assaults and other violent acts to support his claim that she was the one who stabbed Lucas. The court did not abuse its discretion in disallowing the cross-examination on the basis of irrelevancy. See State v. Zaehringer, 280 N.W.2d 416, 419-20 (Iowa 1979). In addition, assaultive crimes or acts of a witness

are not admissible to impeach his or her credibility since they "have little or no direct bearing on honesty and veracity." Martin, 217 N.W.2d at 540-41.

Defendant's convictions and sentence are affirmed.

AFFIRMED.