

**Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.**

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

**P. STEPHEN MILLER**  
Fort Wayne, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

**STEVE CARTER**  
Attorney General of Indiana

**MATTHEW D. FISHER**  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

**IN THE  
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

---

TABRINA WATTS,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Defendant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 02A03-0703-CR-133
	)	
STATE OF INDIANA,	)	
	)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.	)	

---

APPEAL FROM THE ALLEN SUPERIOR COURT  
The Honorable Frances C. Gull, Judge  
Cause No. 02D04-0608-FB-165

---

**August 28, 2007**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**SHARPNACK, Judge**

Tabrina Watts appeals her sentence for two counts of robbery as class B felonies.<sup>1</sup> Watts raises one issue, which we revise and restate as whether her sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. We affirm.

The relevant facts follow. On July 21, 2006, seventeen-year-old Watts and several friends drove up to where Stephanie Kale was walking and ambushed her. The group knocked Kale's glasses off and injured her. The group then took Kale's purse and her cell phone. On July 22, 2006, the group did the same thing, only this time there were two victims, Amanda Sorg and Tiffany Price, who was pregnant. Again, the group violently punched and kicked Sorg and Price and then took their purses and cell phones.

The State charged Watts with two counts of robbery as class B felonies. On November 3, 2006, Watts pleaded guilty to both robbery charges. Watts's plea agreement was capped at a maximum of ten years executed for each count, with each party to argue regarding whether the sentences should run consecutively or concurrently. The trial court sentenced Watts to "confinement for a period of ten years; provided however, that six years of said sentence is ordered executed and the remainder of four years is ordered suspended and defendant placed on Active Adult Probation for a period of two years." Appellant's Appendix at 39. The trial court ordered the sentences to run consecutively.

The sole issue is whether Watts's sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. Ind. Appellate Rule 7(B) provides that "the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ind. Code § 35-42-5-1 (2004).

court may revise a sentence . . . if, after due consideration of the trial court's decision, [we find] that the sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender." Under this rule, the burden is on the defendant to persuade the appellate court that his or her sentence is inappropriate. Childress v. State, 848 N.E.2d 1073, 1080 (Ind. 2006).

Our review of the nature of the offense reveals that for each robbery the victims were not just attacked, but ambushed by a group while walking down the street. The offenses were physical, violent, and resulted in each victim being injured. Moreover, the robbery and attack of a pregnant woman in one of the robberies makes the offense even more abhorrent. The pregnant victim told the group that she was pregnant, and yet they continued to kick her after she fell to the ground.

Our review of the character of the offender reveals that Watts had no criminal record. However, Watts went along, not once, but twice, to intimidate, injure, and rob three victims. Watts allowed her accomplices to beat up a pregnant woman. Even though there was time between each offense for her to consider her wrongdoing, Watts did not consider it and, after committing the first robbery, she committed a more violent and brutal robbery the very next day.

After due consideration of the trial court, given the ambush-style of the robberies, the violence against a pregnant woman, and the disregard that Watts has shown, we cannot find that the sentence imposed by the trial court is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. See, e.g., Patterson v. State, 846 N.E.2d 723, 731 (Ind. Ct. App. 2006) (holding that the defendant's sentence was not

inappropriate for robbery convictions where serious injury occurred and there was only a small chance of deterrence present).

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm Watts's twenty-year sentence.

Affirmed.

MAY, J. and BAILEY, J. concur