

# 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

Alexander W. Robbins  
The Law Office of Alexander Robbins  
Bedford, Indiana

## ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE

Theodore E. Rokita  
Attorney General of Indiana

Alexandria Sons  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

# IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

---

Tiffany Goodnight,  
*Appellant-Defendant,*

v.

State of Indiana,  
*Appellee-Plaintiff.*

March 2, 2022

Court of Appeals Case No.  
21A-CR-2124

Appeal from the Morgan Superior  
Court

The Honorable Brian H. Williams,  
Judge

Trial Court Cause No.  
55D02-2101-CM-57

**Baker, Senior Judge.**

## Statement of the Case

- [1] Tiffany Goodnight struck her live-in boyfriend during an argument. She appeals her conviction of domestic battery, a Class A misdemeanor.<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

## Issue

- [2] Goodnight raises one issue, which we restate as: whether the evidence is sufficient to sustain her conviction.

## Facts and Procedural History

- [3] Goodnight and Clayton Harris were in a romantic relationship for approximately one year, and they had an infant child together. They also lived together during that span of time, along with Goodnight's child from a prior relationship. On December 10, 2020, Harris returned home from work to discover that Goodnight was packing her personal property and her children's items. She told him that she was moving in with someone else.
- [4] Harris was angry and stated, "if you want to leave, you can leave." Tr. Vol. 2, p. 17. He took some of Goodnight's items outside and "slammed" them on the ground next to her car. *Id.* at 26. She also became angry and struck his face as he was walking out the door with more items, scratching his face and breaking his glasses. Harris called the police, but Goodnight left before they arrived.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ind. Code § 35-42-2-1.3 (2020).

One of the officers photographed Harris' face, depicting a long scratch running from the right side of his nose down his cheek.

[5] An officer called Goodnight. She denied striking Harris and claimed his dog had caused the scratch. The officer asked Goodnight to come to the police department the next night, and she agreed to appear. Goodnight never appeared at the department or otherwise met with the officer.

[6] On January 11, 2021, the State charged Goodnight with domestic battery, a Class A misdemeanor, and disorderly conduct, a Class B misdemeanor.<sup>2</sup> The trial judge presided over a bench trial and determined that the State had “proven all the material elements” of both charges. Appellant’s App. Vol. 2, p. 14. The court determined Goodnight was guilty of domestic battery and merged the charge of disorderly conduct into the domestic battery count. Next, the court imposed a sentence. This appeal followed.

## Discussion and Decision

[7] Goodnight argues there is not enough evidence to sustain her conviction. When an appellant challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting a conviction, we do not reweigh the evidence or judge the credibility of the witnesses. *Croy v. State*, 953 N.E.2d 660, 662 (Ind. Ct. App. 2011). We consider only the evidence most favorable to the judgment and the reasonable

---

<sup>2</sup> Ind. Code § 35-45-1-3 (2014).

inferences stemming from that evidence. *Manuel v. State*, 971 N.E.2d 1262, 1269 (Ind. Ct. App. 2012). We affirm if there is substantial evidence of probative value supporting each element of the crime from which a reasonable trier of fact could have found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Davis v. State*, 813 N.E.2d 1176, 1178 (Ind. 2004).

[8] To obtain a conviction of Class A misdemeanor domestic battery, the State was required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that (1) Goodnight (2) knowingly or intentionally (3) touched (4) a family or household member (5) in a rude, insolent, or angry manner. Ind. Code section 35-42-2-1.3.

[9] Goodnight does not dispute that Harris was a family or household member for purposes of the domestic battery charge. And Harris testified that Goodnight became angry and struck him in the face, scratching him and breaking his glasses. By contrast, Goodnight points to her own testimony, in which she denied striking Harris and claimed his dog had caused the scratch. She is, in essence, asking the Court to reweigh the evidence, contrary to our standard of review. The State presented sufficient evidence of probative value to support Goodnight's conviction beyond a reasonable doubt.

## Conclusion

[10] For the reasons stated above, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

[11] Affirmed.

May, J., and Crone, J., concur.