

**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:

**J. PATRICK BIGGS**  
Chief Public Defender  
New Albany, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

**STEPHEN R. CARTER**  
Attorney General of Indiana

**GARY DAMON SECREST**  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

**IN THE  
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

---

RICKY E. GRAHAM, )  
 )  
Appellant-Defendant, )  
 )  
vs. ) No. 22A01-0703-CR-117  
 )  
STATE OF INDIANA, )  
 )  
Appellee-Plaintiff. )

---

APPEAL FROM THE FLOYD SUPERIOR COURT  
The Honorable Susan L. Orth, Judge  
Cause No. 22D01-0603-FA-208

---

**July 31, 2007**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**  
**MAY, Judge**

Ricky Graham appeals the order that he serve his previously suspended sentence after he violated his probation.<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

## FACTS

Graham entered a plea of guilty to possession of marijuana. The plea agreement provided Graham would be sentenced to three years with 32 months suspended to probation. The State alleged Graham violated probation by failing to report to the probation office as directed.<sup>2</sup> The court so found and ordered Graham to serve the remainder of the suspended sentence.

## DISCUSSION AND DECISION

We review a decision to revoke probation and a sentencing decision in a probation revocation proceeding for an abuse of discretion. *Sanders v. State*, 825 N.E.2d 952, 956 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005), *trans. denied* 841 N.E.2d 175 (Ind. 2005). Proof of a single violation of the conditions of probation is sufficient to support the decision to revoke probation. *Bussberg v. State*, 827 N.E.2d 37, 44 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005), *reh'g denied, trans. denied* 841 N.E.2d 182 (Ind. 2005). The court heard testimony Graham had been directed to report to the probation office but did not report on the scheduled date nor did he contact the probation office at any time before his revocation hearing. We acknowledge Graham's assertion the evidence he failed to report was "sparse," (Br. of

---

<sup>1</sup> Graham offers as his "Statement of Issues" [sic] "Was Defendant's sentence inappropriate under the circumstances?" (Br. of Appellant at 3), but his argument in fact appears to be that the evidence did not support the revocation of his probation. A defendant may not collaterally challenge his sentence on appeal from his probation revocation. *Sanders v. State*, 825 N.E.2d 952, 956 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005), *trans. denied* 841 N.E.2d 175 (Ind. 2005).

<sup>2</sup> The State alleged additional violations but it appears the trial court premised the revocation only on Graham's failure to report.

Appellant at 10), but we decline his invitation to reweigh it. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by ordering Graham to serve his suspended sentence. We accordingly affirm.

Affirmed.

SHARNACK, J., and BAILEY, J., concur.