STATE OF IOWA,)
Plaintiff-Appellee,) Filed September 23, 1980
vs.)
ROBERT MATLOCK, JR.,) 0-197 / 63507
Defendant-Appellant.)

Appeal from Black Hawk District Court - Forest E. Eastman, Judge.

Defendant appeals nonjury conviction of second degree robbery in violation of section 711.3, supplement to the Code 1977, alleging the burden of proof was improperly shifted to him when the State was allowed to introduce into evidence certain nonculpatory statements made by him to police. AFFIRMED.

W. H. Gilliam of Gottschalk & Gilliam, Cedar Falls, Iowa, for defendant-appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General of Iowa, and Julie Pottorff, Assistant Attorney General, for plaintiff-appellee.

Heard by Oxberger, C.J., and Donielson, Snell, Carter and Johnson, JJ.

Defendant, Robert Matlock, Jr., appeals his nonjury conviction of second degree robbery in violation of section 711.3, supplement to the Code 1977. He alleges the burden of proof was improperly shifted to him when the State was allowed to introduce into evidence certain nonculpatory statements made by him to police. We affirm.

When the statements were offered into evidence at trial, defendant's attorney objected in the following terms:

> Well, your Honor, I object to the admission of these exhibits, with respect to Exhibit C [written summary of defendant's statements], for the reason that the Defendant has not testified in this proceeding, as yet; that he has right to testify in his own behalf, or to decline to testify, and introducing these exhibits at this time would not be permissable [sic].

Trial court overruled the objection. On appeal, defendant claims the statements impermissibly shifted the burden of proof to defendant to come forward with evidence. He further claims in his reply brief that the statements were inadmissible hearsay.

Objections to the admissibility of evidence may not be raised for the first time on appeal. State v. Matlock, 289 N.W.2d 625, 628 (Iowa 1980); State v. Whiteside, 272 N.W.2d 468, 472 (Iowa 1978). We limit our review only to those grounds asserted in trial court. Matlock, 289 N.W.2d at 628. We conclude defendant asserts on appeal that the statements are inadmissible for reasons not urged in trial court. Because defendant failed to preserve error properly, we do not consider his arguments on the merits and therefore affirm his conviction.

AFFIRMED.