FILED
JAN 29 1986
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

STATE OF IOWA,	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	Filed January 29, 1986
vs.	)	344
IRVIN EUGENE JOHNSON,	)	5-576 84-1801
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

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

Defendant appeals his conviction for sexual abuse in the first degree in violation of Iowa Code section 709.2. **AFFIRMED.**

Charles Harrington, Chief Appellate Defender, and Raymond E. Rogers, Assistant Appellate Defender, for defendant-appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General of Iowa, and Elizabeth E. Ciebell, Assistant Attorney General; Jim Smith, Polk County Attorney, and Patricia Houlihan, Assistant County Attorney; for defendant-appellant.

Considered by Donielson, P.J., Snell, and Hayden, JJ.

Defendant appeals his conviction for sexual abuse in the first degree in violation of Iowa Code section 709.2. He asserts that his motion for mistrial should have been sustained. We affirm.

Irvin Johnson was convicted of first degree sexual abuse following a jury trial at which his fifteen-year-old stepdaughter testified that he had stabbed and sexually assaulted her. Medical evidence relating to her injuries was also introduced. Johnson denied the assault and introduced evidence that he was elsewhere at the time of its occurrence. Defense counsel also elicited some inconsistencies in the victim's testimony.

On direct examination of Johnson's wife, the prosecution elicited testimony that on the night preceding the crime she and defendant had watched a movie on television in which a "young guy" was "going around raping these girls." The trial court sustained the objection of defense counsel, struck the answer, and admonished the jury to disregard it but overruled motion for mistrial. A cautionary instruction was subsequently given. The court, however, overruled Johnson's motion for a mistrial.

On appeal, Johnson complains that the trial court abused its discretion in denying him a new trial. We do not agree.

A trial court has considerable discretion in determining whether or not to grant a mistrial. State v. Chadwick, 328 N.W.2d 913, 916 (Iowa 1983); State v. Mattingly, 220 N.W.2d 865, 870 (Iowa 1974). As a general rule, improper testimony is not considered unduly prejudicial if the court admonishes the jury to disregard it. State v. Williams, 315 N.W.2d 45, 55-56 (Iowa 1982). Only in those exceptional cases in which the prejudicial effect of such a comment cannot be eliminated will an admonition of the court be found insufficient. Id. at 56.

In the present case, we conclude the trial court's admonition sufficiently guarded against any potential prejudice. The testimony in question was not so highly inflammatory that it would lead us to believe the jury would disregard the subsequent admonishment. On the record before us, we find no abuse of discretion.

AFFIRMED.