

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-150171
	:	TRIAL NO. B-1403907A
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
vs.	:	
RONALD COLLINS,	:	
	:	
Defendants-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 2; App.R. 11.1(E); Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Following a guilty plea, defendant-appellant Ronald Collins was convicted of burglary under R.C. 2911.12(B), a fourth-degree felony. The trial court sentenced him to serve 180 days' confinement, with credit for 230 days he had already served, to be followed by three years of community control with intensive supervision.

In his sole assignment of error, Collins contends that the trial court erred by imposing a sentence that was not supported by findings in the record. He argues that the trial court did not consider all the relevant factors, and that if it had, it would have sentenced him to time served with no community-control sanction. This assignment of error is not well taken.

The record shows that the trial court specifically stated that it had considered the purposes and principles of sentencing and the various factors under R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12. *See State v. Alexander*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-110828 and C-

OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

110829, 2012-Ohio-3349, ¶ 23-24. Collins argues that the court did not consider the existence of substantial grounds for mitigation under R.C. 2929.12(C)(4). Though the trial court did not specifically state that it had considered the grounds for mitigation, the record shows that the court heard Collins's arguments in mitigation and that it considered them. The court simply found other facts, such as his previous criminal record, more persuasive. Further, while a trial court is required to consider all of the factors under R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12, it need not make any specific findings. *State v. Bohannon*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-130014, 2013-Ohio-5101, ¶ 7.

Before a reviewing court can modify or vacate a felony sentence, it must clearly and convincingly find that the sentence is contrary to law or that the record does not support the trial court's findings. *State v. White*, 2013-Ohio-4225, 997 N.E.2d 629, ¶ 11 (1st Dist.). Collins has not affirmatively demonstrated that the trial court did not consider the appropriate factors. *See Bohannon* at ¶ 7-9. On the record before us, we cannot say that Collins's sentence was clearly and convincingly contrary to law. *See White* at ¶ 12-14. Consequently, we overrule his assignment of error and affirm the trial court's judgment.

A certified copy of this judgment entry constitutes the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

HENDON, P.J., CUNNINGHAM and MOCK, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on October 23, 2015
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge