FILED
FEB 26 1986
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

64

SAMUEL FRANCIS CATALDO,	)	
Plaintiff-Appellant,	)	Filed February 26,1986
vs	)	5-645 85-320
PIE EYED PIES, INC.	)	
Defendant-Appellee.	)	

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County (No. 50-29336), Ray A Fenton, Judge.

Plaintiff appeals an adverse judgment in the underlying personal injury action contending the trial court erred in excluding evidence offered to show bias and interest of a witness. **AFFIRMED.**

Virgil Moore, Des Moines, for plaintiff-appellant.

Paul C. Thune, Des Moines, for defendant-appellee.

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

This appeal presents one succinct issue for our review; whether the trial court erred in not allowing evidence to be presented of the bias of a witness appearing for the defendant. We affirm.

The plaintiff and appellant, Samuel Cataldo, filed his petition alleging that on February 15, 1982, he was a business invitee of the defendant, Pie-Eyed Pies, Inc., and was severely injured when he fell on snow and ice negligently allowed to accumulate on defendant's parking lot. Pie-Eyed Pies responded by claiming that the sole proximate cause of plaintiff's injury was his own negligence.

During the trial, the defendant introduced Jim Compton as a witness. He testified that the plaintiff had asked him to be a witness to the accident, although Compton had no personal knowledge of the incident. Compton added that he thought the plaintiff was joking, and that he felt Cataldo was an honest person.

The plaintiff sought to introduce evidence he claimed proved the witness was biased. The court would not allow cross examination regarding the alleged bias, and an offer of proof was made. It showed that Compton would testify the Mike Anania Insurance Agency wrote the insurance coverage in this action and that Compton had a twenty-year friendship with Mike Anania. Compton lives in a house Anania owns, borrows his car, and spends time in Anania's office. The proof further showed Compton would testify he has heard Mike Anania express his concerns about his loss ratio in liability claims such as this.

The trial court has considerable discretion in determining whether to allow particular cross-examination of witnesses. State v. Orozco, 190 N.W.2d 830, 833 (Iowa 1971). The court is allowed to exclude evidence otherwise admissible if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice,

if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury. Iowa Rule Evid. 403. It has been long recognized in this jurisdiction that evidence showing insurance coverage regarding a negligence claim is inadmissible. Evans v. Howard R. Green Co., 231 N.W.2d 907, 914 (Iowa 1975). "It remains true in a personal injury or death action evidence is generally inadmissible which informs the jury a defendant is insured against liability. It is generally improper for the subject of liability insurance to be raised in any way before the jury." Id.

Our review of this action at law is limited to correcting errors of law or to prevent an abuse of the court's discretion. Iowa R. App. P. 4. In weighing the probative value of the evidence with its result of injecting inadmissible evidence into the trial, we find no abuse of discretion by the trial court and affirm its ruling.

AFFIRMED.