

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

Johnny W. Ulmer
Ulmer Law Offices
Elkhart, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE

Theodore E. Rokita
Attorney General
Steven J. Hosler
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

Timothy L. Patrick,
Appellant-Defendant,

v.

State of Indiana,
Appellee-Plaintiff

April 4, 2022

Court of Appeals Case No.
21A-CR-1562

Appeal from the
Elkhart Superior Court

The Honorable
Teresa L. Cataldo, Judge

Trial Court Cause No.
20D03-2001-F1-1

Vaidik, Judge.

- [1] Timothy L. Patrick appeals his sentence of 100 years, with ten years suspended to probation, for two counts of Level 1 felony child molesting and one count of

Level 4 felony child molesting. In his statement of the issue, he asserts his sentence “is inappropriate in light of the character of the offender.” Appellant’s Br. p. 4. The remainder of his brief, however, is woefully inadequate. His statement of facts is one sentence and includes no details of his crimes, in violation of Appellate Rule 46(A)(6) (providing that the appellant’s statement of facts “shall describe the facts relevant to the issues presented for review”). His argument consists of two conclusory sentences and includes no citations to the record, in violation of Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a) (providing that the appellant’s argument must be supported by “cogent reasoning” and “citations to . . . the Appendix or parts of the Record on Appeal relied on”). Patrick has essentially made no argument at all. Therefore, we find his appellate claim waived, and we affirm his sentence. *See Basic v. Amouri*, 58 N.E.3d 980, 984 (Ind. Ct. App. 2016) (“While we prefer to decide issues on the merits, where the appellant’s noncompliance with appellate rules is so substantial as to impede our consideration of the issues, we may deem the alleged errors waived.”), *reh’g denied*.

[2] Affirmed.

Najam, J., and Weissmann, J., concur.