

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**

No. 2-733 / 10-1712  
Filed September 19, 2012

**STATE OF IOWA,**  
Plaintiff-Appellee,

**vs.**

**ROBERT L. SWIFT,**  
Defendant-Appellant.

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Scott County, Douglas C. McDonald, Judge.

Robert Swift challenges the sufficiency of the evidence to sustain his conviction. **AFFIRMED.**

Mark C. Smith, State Appellate Defender, and Shellie L. Knipfer, Assistant Appellate Defender, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Michael L. Bennett, Assistant Attorney General, Michael J. Walton, County Attorney, and Robert C. Bradfield, Assistant County Attorney, for appellee.

Considered by Vaitheswaran, P.J., and Potterfield and Bower, JJ.

**POTTERFIELD, J.**

Robert Swift challenges the sufficiency of the evidence as to his identity to sustain his conviction for driving while barred. We review challenges to the sufficiency of evidence for errors at law. *State v. McCullah*, 787 N.W.2d 90, 93 (Iowa 2010). We will uphold a jury's verdict if the record contains substantial evidence supporting the defendant's conviction. *Id.* Substantial evidence means evidence that could convince a rational trier of fact the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Id.*

We conclude substantial evidence supports the jury's verdicts. Swift stipulated that his driver's license was barred as an habitual offender. A witness who had known Swift for several years testified that Swift was driving a vehicle when Swift pulled up beside him and began yelling at him. The witness called 911 and was told to go to the police station. Swift followed the witness to the police station, but drove away as Officer Eric Gruenhagen approached him. The witness identified Swift in a photo array and made an in-court identification of Swift as the driver. Officer Gruenhagen testified he arrested Swift a few days later at a hotel where he also found the red car he had seen leaving the station. Though Officer Gruenhagen did not see the driver's face, he testified Swift's appearance was not contrary to the person he saw in the red car. We affirm without further opinion. See Iowa R. App. P. 6.1203(b).

**AFFIRMED.**