



abuse of discretion standard of review, rather than a de novo standard. State v. Harkins, 811 S.W.2d 79 (Tenn. 1991). Discretion is abused only if the record contains no substantial evidence to support the conclusion of the trial court that a violation of probation has occurred. Id.; State v. Gregory, 946 S.W.2d 829, 832 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1997). Proof of a violation need not be established beyond a reasonable doubt, and the evidence need only show that the trial judge exercised a conscientious and intelligent judgment, rather than acting arbitrarily. Gregory, 946 S.W.2d at 832; State v. Leach, 914 S.W.2d 104, 106 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1995).

On appeal, the appellant contends only that the trial court abused its discretion in revoking his probation. He argues that “[t]he trial court should have, instead, incarcerated Mr. Bray for a short period of time and then released him on intensive probation after obtaining drug treatment for him.” Having reviewed the record in light of the appellant’s argument, we find that the evidence fully supports the trial court’s action. The appellant has simply failed to show how the trial court abused its discretion.

Accordingly, the state’s motion is granted. It is hereby ORDERED that the judgement of the trial court is affirmed in accordance with Rule 20, Rules of the Court of Criminal Appeals. Costs of this appeal shall be assessed to the state.

---

JOE G. RILEY, JUDGE

---

DAVID G. HAYES, JUDGE

---

JOHN EVERETT WILLIAMS, JUDGE