

*This opinion will be unpublished and
may not be cited except as provided by
Minn. Stat. § 480A.08, subd. 3 (2006).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A06-1569**

State of Minnesota,
Respondent,

vs.

Jimmy Micius,
Appellant.

**Filed January 29, 2008
Affirmed
Kalitowski, Judge**

Ramsey County District Court
File No. T0-06-15191

Lori Swanson, Attorney General, 1800 Bremer Tower, 445 Minnesota Street, St. Paul, MN 55101-2134; and

John J. Choi, St. Paul City Attorney, Jessica S. McConaughy, Assistant City Attorney, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard, 500 City Hall, St. Paul, MN 55102 (for respondent)

Jimmy Micius, 755 West Minnehaha, St. Paul, MN 55104 (pro se appellant)

Considered and decided by Hudson, Presiding Judge; Kalitowski, Judge; and
Muehlberg, Judge.*

* Retired judge of the district court, serving as judge of the Minnesota Court of Appeals by appointment pursuant to Minn. Const. art. VI, § 10.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

KALITOWSKI, Judge

Appellant Jimmy Micius challenges his conviction of petty misdemeanor speeding. We affirm.

DECISION

Pro se appellant appears to contend that the record does not support his conviction. We disagree.

This court reviews a sufficiency of the evidence claim to determine whether a factfinder could reasonably conclude that the defendant was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the offense charged in light of the facts in the record and all the legitimate inferences that can be drawn in favor of conviction from those facts. *Davis v. State*, 595 N.W.2d 520, 525 (Minn. 1999). This standard of review applies to bench trials as well as to jury trials. *Id.*

The applicable statute provides: “No person shall drive a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent under the conditions.” Minn. Stat. § 169.14, subd. 1 (2006). A speed in excess of posted limits is “prima facie evidence that the speed is not reasonable or prudent” Minn. Stat. § 169.14, subd. 2(a) (2006). Moreover, a speed-measuring device is an accepted method of proving speed. *See State v. Aanerud*, 374 N.W.2d 491, 492 (Minn. App. 1985) (affirming appellant’s conviction for speeding based on radar readings and the officer’s testimony). And evidence of speed as assessed by a speed-measuring device is admissible provided that the officer is sufficiently trained, the officer testifies to the manner in which the device was operated,

the operation of the device was not distorted by outside sources, and the device was tested by an accurate and reliable external mechanism. Minn. Stat. § 169.14, subd. 10(a) (2006).

Here, appellant was convicted of speeding and assessed a fine consistent with one to ten miles above the speed limit. The citing officer testified about his laser-detection device training and about the reliability of the laser device, as required by statute. Although the testimony of the officer differed from that of appellant's witness, both witnesses stated that appellant was traveling above the speed limit. We conclude that the evidence in the record supports the district court's decision.

Finally, we have reviewed the other arguments made by appellant in his pro se brief and conclude that they are without merit.

Affirmed.