ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

MICHAEL P. QUIRK
Muncie, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General of Indiana

MICHAEL GENE WORDEN
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

JAMES C. CALDWELL,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Defendant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 18A02-0704-CR-334
	)	
STATE OF INDIANA,	)	
	)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.	)	

APPEAL FROM THE DELAWARE CIRCUIT COURT
The Honorable Marianne L. Vorhees, Judge
Cause No. 18C01-0610-FD-141

October 25, 2007

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CRONE, Judge

James Caldwell appeals his sentence for class D felony theft. We affirm.

On October 10, 2006, Caldwell stole two thirty-dollar MP3 players from a Family Dollar store in Muncie. He was apprehended shortly after leaving the store. At that time, he was on parole from a prior robbery conviction. On March 1, 2007, Caldwell pled guilty to class D felony theft pursuant to a plea agreement, the terms of which called for an eighteen-month cap on the theft sentence, to be served consecutive to the sentence in the case for which he was on parole when he committed the theft. At the April 2 sentencing hearing, Caldwell requested a suspended sentence and probation. The trial court imposed the advisory sentence of eighteen months, to be fully executed.

Caldwell contends that his sentence is inappropriate. Indiana Appellate Rule 7(B) states that "[t]he Court may revise a sentence authorized by statute if, after due consideration of the trial court's decision, the Court finds that the sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender." A defendant must persuade the appellate court that his sentence has met the inappropriateness standard of review. *Anglemyer v. State*, 868 N.E.2d 482, 494 (Ind. 2007).

Caldwell specifically asserts that revision is appropriate based on the relatively low dollar value of the items he stole. However, Caldwell ignores his criminal history, which includes two juvenile adjudications and convictions for robbery and burglary. He has demonstrated a pattern of unwillingness to keep his hands off other people's property. Moreover, his probation and parole violations demonstrate that suspended sentences have proven futile. We find no basis for revising Caldwell's sentence.

Affirmed.

DARDEN, J., and MAY, J., concur.