

Jeffrey Jones (“Jones”) was convicted in Tippecanoe Superior Court of Class D felony receiving stolen property and found to be an habitual offender. The trial court ordered him to serve an aggregate sentence of seven and one-half years. He appeals and argues that his sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and character of the offender. We affirm.

Facts and Procedural History

On July 26, 2006, Jones pleaded guilty to Class D felony receiving stolen property and to being an habitual offender. At sentencing, the trial court found the following aggravating circumstances: Jones’s criminal history, his history of substance abuse, that Jones is in need of correctional or rehabilitative treatment that can best be provided by commitment to a penal facility, and that prior attempts at corrective and rehabilitative treatment have failed. The court ordered Jones to serve three years for his receiving stolen property conviction and enhanced that sentence by four and one-half years for the habitual offender adjudication. The court then suspended one and one-half years to probation. Jones now appeals. Additional facts will be provided as necessary.

Discussion and Decision

Jones argues that his aggregate sentence of seven and one half years is inappropriate. Appellate courts have the constitutional authority to revise a sentence if, after consideration of the trial court’s decision, the court concludes the sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and character of the offender. Ind. Appellate Rule 7(B) (2007), Marshall v. State, 832 N.E.2d 615, 624 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005), trans. denied.

Concerning the nature of the offense, we agree with Jones’s assertion that his offense was not the “worst of the worst.” Jones received stolen gift cards worth approximately \$200 and a gold necklace after his brother burglarized the victim’s home.

However, Jones has an extensive criminal history dating back to 1983, which includes misdemeanor convictions for conversion and theft, four felony convictions for breaking and entering with intent to commit larceny, escape, theft, and possession of cocaine, and several probation violations. Tr. pp. 31-35; Appellant’s App. pp. 31-32. As the trial court noted, Jones has a “long criminal history involving a pattern of dishonesty and substance abuse.” Tr. p. 36.

In light of Jones’s character, we conclude that his seven-and-one-half-year sentence is not inappropriate.¹

Affirmed.

DARDEN, J., and KIRSCH, J., concur.

¹ Because Jones has not cited any authority in support of his argument that his cooperation with the police “was entitled to weight as a mitigator,” his claim is waived. See Ind. Appellate Rule 46(A)(8) (2006).