

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.

APPELLANT PRO SE:

**SHAWN D. LANE**  
Tell City, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

**STEVE CARTER**  
Attorney General of Indiana

**NICOLE M. SCHUSTER**  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

**IN THE  
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

---

SHAWN D. LANE, )  
 )  
 Appellant-Defendant, )  
 )  
 vs. ) No. 45A03-0607-CR-340  
 )  
 STATE OF INDIANA, )  
 )  
 Appellee-Plaintiff. )

---

APPEAL FROM THE LAKE SUPERIOR COURT  
The Honorable Salvador Vasquez, Judge  
Cause No. 45G01-0108-CF-178

---

**December 28, 2006**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**KIRSCH, Chief Judge**

Shawn D. Lane appeals the denial of his motion to correct erroneous sentence contending that the trial court failed to give him good time credit for pre-trial confinement. We affirm.

In its order denying Lane's motion, the trial court stated:

Motion denied. In the absence of a specific order to the contrary, any defendant is presumed to have earned good time credit. However, to be clear, the defendant was entitled to receive good time credit for the four hundred forty five (445) days in pre-trial confinement as of his sentencing date on July 18, 2003.

*Appellant's Appendix* at 7.

In *Robinson v. State*, 805 N.E.2d 783, 792 (Ind. 2004), our Supreme Court held:

Sentencing judgments that report only days spent in pre-sentence confinement and fail to expressly designate credit time earned shall be understood by courts and by the Department of Correction automatically to award the number of credit time days equal to the number of pre-sentence confinement days . . . . Because the omission of designation of the statutory credit time entitlement is thus corrected by this presumption, such omission may not be raised as an erroneous sentence.

*Id.*

The trial court correctly followed the direction of our Supreme Court in *Robinson*.

Affirmed.

RILEY, J., and FRIEDLANDER, J., concur.