Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

**ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:** 

**ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:** 

**GREGORY L. FUMAROLO** 

Fort Wayne, Indiana

GREGORY F. ZOELLER Attorney General of Indiana

**GARY R. ROM** 

Deputy Attorney General Indianapolis, Indiana

FILED

Dec 14 2010, 9:41 am

Sevin Sanita

CLERK

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

)
) )
) No. 02A04-1003-CR-239
)
)

APPEAL FROM THE ALLEN SUPERIOR COURT The Honorable Kenneth R. Scheibenberger, Judge Cause No. 02D04-0908-FB-163

**December 14, 2010** 

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

BRADFORD, Judge

Appellant/Defendant John Eddie Lindsey appeals his conviction for Class B felony Dealing in Cocaine. Specifically, Lindsey contends that the evidence was insufficient to prove his identity, *i.e.*, that he was the individual who delivered the cocaine to the undercover detectives. Concluding that the evidence presented at trial was sufficient to sustain Lindsey's conviction, we affirm.

## FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 12, 2008, Fort Wayne Police Detectives Darrin Strayer and Jamie Masters were engaged in an undercover investigation of individuals suspected of dealing narcotics in an area of Fort Wayne known for its high crime rate and narcotic activity. As part of their undercover investigation, Detective Masters was driving, and Detective Strayer was a passenger in an unmarked single-cab pick-up truck. Upon approaching a group of individuals standing near the street, Detectives Masters and Strayer asked for "Brian" from whom they had previously purchased narcotics. The detectives were informed that "Brian" was not present, but another man, later identified as Lindsey, approached the detectives and asked what the detectives were looking for. Detective Strayer replied that they were looking for a "40 rock," or "\$40.00 worth of crack cocaine." Tr. p. 83. Lindsey informed the detectives that he could find them the drugs, but in exchange, he wanted Detective Strayer to "break off a piece" for him. Detective Strayer refused Lindsey's request, and Detective

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ind. Code § 35-48-4-1 (2007).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Detective Strayer testified that "break off a piece" means that Detective Strayer would give Lindsey a portion of the narcotics for his personal use in exchange for him helping Detective Strayer to acquire the drugs.

Masters drove away.

Detectives Strayer and Masters were flagged down by another individual who identified himself as "Frank" after Detective Masters had driven approximately four or five blocks. "Frank" approached the passenger side of the pick-up truck and asked what they were doing, by which time Lindsey had caught up with the detectives' vehicle. Lindsey told Detective Strayer that he could deliver forty dollars worth of crack cocaine, and Strayer handed Lindsey the photo-copied buy money. Lindsey told Detective Strayer that he would return in approximately five minutes with the drugs, but when he returned three to five minutes later, he told Detective Strayer that he needed a few more minutes to obtain the drugs. Lindsey, who still had the money that Detective Strayer had given to him for the purchase of the drugs, instructed Detective Masters to drive up the street where he would meet them in five to eight minutes. "Frank" then got into the pick-up truck and rode with Detectives Strayer and Masters to the spot identified by Lindsey.

About five minutes later, Lindsey returned with a plastic bag containing the agreed upon amount of cocaine. Lindsey reiterated that he wanted Detective Strayer to "break off a piece" for him. Detective Strayer, however, was reluctant to handle the cocaine with his bare hands. While Lindsey and Detective Strayer discussed Lindsey's desire that Detective Strayer "break off a piece," "Frank" grabbed the plastic bag containing the drugs and bit off a piece for Detective Strayer to give to Lindsey. Detective Strayer attempted to give the bitten-off piece to Lindsey, but Lindsey replied that it was too small and returned the piece to Detective Strayer. Detective Masters then drove away. Later that evening, Detectives

Strayer and Masters confirmed both Lindsey's identity and that the substance in the plastic bag was indeed cocaine.

On August 31, 2009, the State charged Lindsey with Class B felony dealing in cocaine. Lindsey was found guilty as charged following a jury trial on January 19, 2010, and was subsequently sentenced to ten years, with six years executed, four suspended, and two years on probation. This appeal follows.

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION**

Lindsey contends that the evidence presented at trial was insufficient to support his Class B felony dealing in cocaine conviction.

The standard for reviewing sufficiency of the evidence claims is well settled. We do not reweigh the evidence or assess the credibility of the witnesses. Rather, we look to the evidence and reasonable inferences drawn therefrom that support the verdict and will affirm the conviction if there is probative evidence from which a reasonable jury could have found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Stewart v. State, 768 N.E.2d 433, 435 (Ind. 2002). The uncorroborated testimony of one witness is sufficient to sustain a conviction on appeal. *Pinkston v. State*, 821 N.E.2d 830, 842 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004), *trans. denied*. Moreover, "it is for the trier of fact to reject a defendant's version of what happened, to determine all inferences arising from the evidence, and to decide which witnesses to believe." *Holeton v. State*, 853 N.E.2d 539, 541 (Ind. Ct. App. 2006).

In order to convict Lindsey of Class B felony dealing in cocaine, the State was required to prove that Lindsey: (1) knowingly and intentionally; (2) delivered; (3) cocaine.

Ind. Code § 35-48-4-1. On appeal, Lindsey does not challenge the jury's determination that an individual knowingly or intentionally delivered cocaine to Detective Strayer, but merely contends that the State failed to prove his identity as the individual who delivered the cocaine to Detective Strayer. Therefore, we will affirm Lindsey's conviction if there was probative evidence from which the jury could have reasonably determined that Lindsey was the individual who delivered the cocaine to Detective Strayer. *See Treadway v. State*, 924 N.E.2d 621, 639-40 (Ind. 2010) (providing that an eyewitness's testimony identifying the defendant as the victim's attacker was sufficient to prove the defendant's identity as the person who attacked the victims).

At trial, Detectives Strayer and Masters both testified that Lindsey agreed to, and in fact did, deliver forty dollars worth of cocaine to Detective Strayer. Both detectives testified that they confirmed Lindsey's identity as the individual who delivered the cocaine to Detective Strayer on June 12, 2008, while continuing their investigation into the drug buy that conspired earlier that day. In addition, both detectives identified Lindsey at trial as the man who delivered the cocaine to Detective Strayer on June 12, 2008. In light of Detectives Strayer's and Masters's testimony, we conclude that the evidence was sufficient to prove that Lindsey was the individual who delivered cocaine to Detective Strayer on the date in question. *See id*.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

KIRSCH, J., and CRONE, J., concur.