## IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

## AT NASHVILLE

## DECEMBER SESSION, 1995



February 13, 1996

STATE OF TENNESSEE,	)		Cecil Crowson, Jr. Appellate Court Clerk
Appellee,	ý	No. 01-C-01	-9505-CC-00133
V.	)	Coffee Cour	nty
LANNY FUSON,  Appellant.	) ) )		L. Ewell, Sr., Judge of Probation)
For the Appellant:		For the Appe	<u>ellee</u> :
Campbell Smoot District Public Defender and Rachel E. Willis Assistant Public Defender 605 E. Carroll St. P.O. Box 260 Tullahoma, TN 37388		and George Line Counsel for Criminal Jus 450 James I Nashville, TI	neral of Tennessee  baugh the State ctice Division Robertson Parkway N 37243-0493  cayne rney General 7
OPINION FILED:			
AFFIRMED			
Joseph M. Tipton Judge			

## OPINION

The defendant, Lanny Fuson, appeals as of right from the revocation of his probation by the Coffee County Circuit Court. He contends that the trial court abused its discretion by revoking his probation.

On November 19, 1993, the defendant pled guilty to theft over \$1,000.00 and received a four-year sentence. The sentence was suspended and probation imposed after he served ninety days. He was then convicted in Kentucky of charges that were pending at the time of the theft conviction. Vickie Farrar, the defendant's probation officer, testified that the defendant escaped while he was serving his sentence on the Kentucky convictions. She said that he was apprehended in Florida approximately six weeks after the escape and that he did not contact her while he was on escape status. The defendant did, however, write her a letter after he was extradited back to Coffee County. In the letter, the defendant apologized for leaving Kentucky and asked her not to revoke his probation.

It was within the trial court's discretion to revoke the defendant's probation if it found by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant violated a condition of his probation. T.C.A. §§ 40-35-310, -311(d); State v. Mitchell, 810 S.W.2d 733, 735 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1991). If the record contains substantial evidence to support the trial court's conclusion that the defendant violated a condition of his probation, no abuse of discretion will be found. Id.

There was substantial and uncontroverted evidence to support the trial court's conclusion that the defendant violated the conditions of his probation. By

escaping and leaving Kentucky without notifying his probation officer, the defendant violated the first and fifth conditions of his probation:

(1) I will obey the laws of the United States, or any State in which I may be, as well as any municipal ordinances.

. . .

Paul G. Summers, Judge \_\_\_\_\_

(5) I will inform my probation officer before changing my residence or employment. I will get the permission of my probation Officer before leaving the State.

We hold that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in revoking the defendant's probation. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

	Joseph M. Tipton, Judge	
CONCUR:		
Joe B. Jones, Presiding Judge		