

Page 76

[3] Defendant also argues that Ms. Williams' testimony was admissible to explain and clarify a subject alluded to by the State on direct examination and that the State "opened the door" to this testimony.

The phrase "opening the door" refers to the principle that "[w]here one party introduces evidence as to a particular fact or transaction, the other party is entitled to introduce evidence in explanation or rebuttal thereof, even though such latter evidence would be incompetent or irrelevant had it been offered initially." *State v. Garner*, 330 N.C. 273, 290, 410 S.E.2d 861, 870 (1991) (quoting *State v. Albert*, 303 N.C. 173, 177, 277 S.E.2d 439, 441 (1981)).

State v. Rose, 335 N.C. 301, 337, 439 S.E.2d 518, 538, *cert. denied*, ___ U.S. ___, 129 L.Ed.2d 883 (1994).

The State presented evidence through Ms. Williams' testimony that defendant, Grip, and two other men asked her to help them rob the victim several days before the killing. Ms. Williams did not give any testimony on direct examination which related to anything Grip told her after the killing, and the excluded testimony did not explain or clarify any evidence presented by the State on her direct examination. For this reason we conclude that the trial court properly excluded the testimony with respect to what Grip told Ms. Williams.