



## **Case Summary**

Douglas Martin appeals his 180-day sentence for two Class A misdemeanors and one Class C misdemeanor. We affirm.

### **Issue**

Martin raises only one issue, which is whether his 180-day sentence is appropriate.

### **Facts**

On January 2, 2008, Martin pled guilty to Class A misdemeanor contributing to the delinquency of a minor, Class A misdemeanor trespass, and Class C misdemeanor possession of alcohol by a minor. The charges stemmed from Martin's attendance at a New Year's Eve party on December 31, 2007. The trial court sentenced Martin to 180 days for the contributing to the delinquency of a minor and trespass convictions and 60 days for the possession conviction, to run concurrently. This appeal followed. With "good time" credit, Martin was set to complete the sentence on March 30, 2008, and was released on April 1, 2008.

### **Analysis**

"Once a sentence has been served, the issue of the validity of the sentence is rendered moot." Lee v. State, 816 N.E.2d 35, 40 n.2 (Ind. 2004) (quoting Irwin v. State, 744 N.E.2d 565, 568 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001)). Martin served his sentence and was released on April 1, 2008. Our analysis of the appropriateness of Martin's sentence would be of no benefit to him at this point. Nor is this an instance where the issue is of great public interest, presents a factual situation likely to reoccur, or is an issue that will continue to evade review. See Jones v. State, 847 N.E.2d 190, 200 (Ind. Ct. App. 2006) (listing

exceptions to the general rule that issues are deemed moot if we are unable to provide effective relief), trans. denied. Martin's claim is moot, does not warrant an exception to the rule, and fails.

### **Conclusion**

The issue presented by Martin's appeal is moot. We affirm.

Affirmed.

FRIEDLANDER, J., and DARDEN, J., concur.