



After a bench trial, Cassandra Gardner was convicted of conversion, a Class A misdemeanor. Ind. Code § 35-43-4-3(a) (2005). She was sentenced to thirty hours of community service. Her appeal challenges the sufficiency of the evidence.

The facts at trial disclose that on June 2, 2010, Gardner entered a Kroger store in Indianapolis. She was observed the entire time by a Kroger security officer. She was seen picking up two boxes of Mylacon. She carried these in her hand and walked to the wine aisle. There, she placed the medications in her purse and selected a bottle of wine. She then proceeded to the U-Scan area for checkout. The security officer testified that Gardner reached into her purse to get a credit card, swiped it and purchased the bottle of wine without attempting to purchase the medications. Gardner placed the wine in a bag and walked toward the exit doors. The security officer stopped her “just as she reached the exit door, past all points of payment.” Tr. p. 11.

The State was required to prove that Gardner knowingly or intentionally exerted unauthorized control over the property of another. *See* Ind. Code § 35-43-4-3(a). Intent and knowledge may be proved by circumstantial evidence and inferred from the circumstances and facts of each case. Also, one is presumed to have intended the reasonable results of his or her own acts. *Heavrin v. State*, 675 N.E.2d 1075, 1079 (Ind. 1996).

The evidence recited above clearly supports the reasonable inference that Gardner knowingly or intentionally exerted unauthorized control over the medications, which were the property of Kroger.

Gardner attempts to dispute the evidence by contending she had overlooked the Mylacon and could pay for it. Her efforts are simply a request that we reweigh the evidence. This we may not do. We consider only the probative evidence and reasonable inferences supporting the decision. The conviction will be affirmed unless no reasonable fact-finder could find the elements of the offense proven beyond a reasonable doubt. *Drane v. State*, 867 N.E.2d 144, 146 (Ind. 2007).

The evidence supports the reasonable inference that Gardner knowingly exercised unauthorized control over the property of the Kroger Company.

Affirmed.

FRIEDLANDER, J., and CRONE, J., concur.