

three convictions violate the double jeopardy prohibitions; the failure of defense counsel to object to the double jeopardy violation amounts to ineffective assistance of counsel;

2. There was insufficient evidence to support the convictions; and,
3. The motion to suppress should have been granted.

After thorough consideration of this proposition and the entire record before us on appeal, including the original record, transcripts, and briefs of the parties, we have determined that relief is warranted for the reasons set forth below.

In Proposition One, McCandless claims her three convictions for Possession of Controlled Dangerous Substance (Cocaine - Count 1, Marijuana - Count 2, and Methamphetamine - Count 3) are violative of the prohibition against double jeopardy. All three types of drugs were found in two containers, stacked on top of each other, beneath the couch in Appellant's residence.

McCandless relies on *Watkins v. State*, 1991 OK CR 119, 829 P.2d 42, *modified*, 1992 OK CR 34, 855 P.2d 141, to argue the three convictions cannot stand. In *Watkins*, the defendant shipped a single package containing cocaine and PCP from Oklahoma to California. He was convicted of two counts of Distribution of CDS and two counts of Conspiracy to Distribute CDS. This Court found he had been doubly punished for a single crime, holding that under the "same evidence test," possession with intent to distribute is a single offense which does not distinguish between types or classifications of drugs.

Similarly, in this case, we find Appellant has been punished three times for a single offense of possession. The statutory language of 63 O.S.Supp.1995, § 2-401 does not provide for separate charges of possession when different substances are found in a single transaction/cache. *Watkins*, 1992 OK CR 34, ¶ 6, 855 P.2d at 142. Accordingly, we find Counts 2 and 3 should be **REVERSED AND REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO DISMISS.**

As to the remaining Counts 1 and 4, we find the evidence sufficient to sustain the convictions. *Carolina v. State*, 1992 OK CR 65, 839 P.2d 663, 665 (possession may be proven by circumstantial evidence); *Spuehler v. State*, 1985 OK CR 132, ¶ 7, 709 P.2d 202, 203. Although a motion to suppress was heard and denied prior to trial, the motion was not reurged at trial and our review is for plain error. We find no plain occurred. *See Cheatham v. State*, 1995 OK CR 32, ¶ 48, 900 P.2d 414, 427. Propositions Two and Three are therefore denied.

DECISION

The Judgment and Sentence imposed on Counts 1 and 4 are **AFFIRMED.** The Judgment and Sentences for Counts 2 and 3 are hereby **REVERSED AND REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO DISMISS**

APPEARANCES AT TRIAL

JOHN STACY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1330 N. CLASSEN
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73106
WAYNE FOURNERAT
P. O. BOX 10868
MIDWEST CITY, OK 73140
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

APPEARANCES ON APPEAL

GLOYD McCOY
COYLE, McCOY, & BURTON
119 N. ROBINSON, SUITE 320
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

LISA JOHNSON
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
OKLAHOMA COUNTY COURTHOUSE
320 ROBERT S. KERR, SUITE 505
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73102
ATTORNEY FOR STATE

W.A. DREW EDMONDSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA
NANCY E. CONNALLY
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
112 STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105
ATTORNEYS FOR STATE

OPINION BY: JOHNSON, V.P.J.

LUMPKIN, P.J.: CONCURS
CHAPEL, J.: CONCURS
STRUBHAR, J.: CONCURS
LILE, J.: CONCURS

RA