

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

AT KNOXVILLE

AUGUST 1997 SESSION

<p>FILED</p> <p>October 3, 1997</p> <p>Cecil Crowson, Jr. Appellate Court Clerk</p>

<p>STATE OF TENNESSEE,</p> <p>Appellee,</p> <p>V.</p> <p>CHARLES ANTHONY RICHARDS,</p> <p>Appellant.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>) C.C.A. No. 03C01-9702-CR-00072</p> <p>)</p> <p>) Sullivan County</p> <p>)</p> <p>) Honorable R. Jerry Beck, Judge</p> <p>)</p> <p>) (Sentencing-Aggravated Robbery)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>
--	---

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Patricia Hall Long
 Attorney at Law
 2100 Riverview Tower
 900 S. Gay Street
 Knoxville, TN 37902

FOR THE APPELLEE:

John Knox Walkup
 Attorney General & Reporter

Marvin E. Clements, Jr.
 Assistant Attorney General
 Criminal Justice Division
 450 James Robertson Parkway
 Nashville, TN 37243-0493

H. Greeley Wells, Jr.
 District Attorney General

Edward E. Wilson
 Asst. Dist. Attorney General
 P.O. Box 526
 Blountville, TN 37617

OPINION FILED: _____

AFFIRMED

PAUL G. SUMMERS,
 Judge

OPINION

The appellant, Charles Anthony Richards, pled guilty to aggravated robbery. After a hearing, he was sentenced to eight years incarceration. His sentence is to be served consecutively to an unrelated federal sentence. The appellant contends that the trial court erred in ordering his sentence to be served consecutively to his federal sentence.

The Tennessee Rules of Criminal Procedure provide that when a defendant is being sentenced and he or she has additional unserved sentences from other states or from federal courts, the sentence imposed shall be consecutive to the unserved sentence unless good cause exists to run the sentences concurrently. Tenn. R. Crim. P. 32(c)(2). Furthermore, consecutive sentencing is proper if the court finds that the defendant has an extensive history of criminal conduct or that the defendant committed the crime while on probation. Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 40-35-115(b)(2) & (6) (1990).

The record reveals that the trial court considered the appellant's extensive history of criminal conduct in determining his sentence. This included committing aggravated robbery while on probation. As the state notes, these were different convictions for different crimes affecting different victims. This Court agrees that the appellant should not get a free ride for multiple criminal conduct. The trial judge had ample authority to order the appellant's sentence to be served consecutively to his federal sentence.

Accordingly, we find no error of law mandating reversal. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PAUL G. SUMMERS, Judge

CONCUR:

GARY R. WADE, Judge

WILLIAM M. BARKER, Judge