

**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.**

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT:

**ANN M. SUTTON**  
Marion County Public Defender  
Indianapolis, Indiana

**LILABERDIA BATTIES**  
Indianapolis, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

**STEPHEN R. CARTER**  
Attorney General of Indiana  
Indianapolis, Indiana

**GEORGE P. SHERMAN**  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

**IN THE  
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

---

JOANN SHERIDAN,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Defendant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 49A02-0701-CR-13
	)	
STATE OF INDIANA,	)	
	)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.	)	

---

APPEAL FROM THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT  
The Honorable Louis Rosenberg, Magistrate  
Cause No. 49F09-0605-FD-090729

---

**AUGUST 16, 2007**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**ROBERTSON, Senior Judge**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Defendant-Appellant Joann Sheridan is appealing her conviction at a bench trial of the Class D felony of residential entry and the Class B misdemeanor of battery.

We affirm.

### ISSUE

Sheridan states the issue as:

“Whether the evidence was sufficient to sustain Jo Ann Sheridan’s conviction for Residential Entry as a class D felony and Battery as a class B misdemeanor.”

### FACTS

A review of the facts, which support the conviction show that Steve Sheridan was the estranged husband of Joann Sheridan and the current boyfriend of Rosemary Brone. Steve Sheridan had been living in the Brone residence on North Whitfield, Indianapolis, for about eight months. D.A was the twelve-year-old son of Rosemary Brone.

D.A. was sitting in the living room speaking to Steve Sheridan when Joann Sheridan, without permission, broke the lock on the front screen door with her fist and ran into the house. D.A. stood up and Joann Sheridan pushed him into a coffee table, causing him pain.

### DISCUSSION AND DECISION

In reviewing a sufficiency of the evidence claim, we neither reweigh the evidence nor assess the credibility of the witnesses. *Love v. State*, 761 N.E.2d 806, 810 (Ind. Ct. App. 2002). We must respect the trier of fact’s exclusive province to weigh conflicting evidence. *McHenry v. State*, 820 N.E.2d 124, 126 (Ind. 2005). We look to the evidence

most favorable to the judgment and reasonable inferences drawn therefrom. *Id.* We will affirm the conviction if there is probative evidence from which a reasonable trier of fact could have found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Id.* A reasonable inference from the evidence supporting the judgment is enough for us to find the evidence to be sufficient. *Id.* The trier of fact is entitled to determine which version of the incident to credit. *Reyburn v. State*, 737 N.E.2d 1169, 1171 (Ind. Ct. App. 2000).

Ind. Code § 35-43-2-1.5 provides that a person who knowingly or intentionally breaks and enters the dwelling of another person commits residential entry as a Class D felony. The evidence shows that Sheridan, without permission, broke the screen door latch and entered the residence of Brone.

Ind. Code § 35-42-2-1 provides that a person who knowingly or intentionally touches another person in a rude, insolent, or angry manner commits battery as a Class B misdemeanor. The evidence shows that Sheridan pushed D. A. into a coffee table and caused him pain.

Sheridan's argument is merely an invitation for this court to reweigh the evidence and assess the credibility of the witnesses. In applying the standard of review for sufficiency of the evidence issues as previously set forth, we find that the evidence is sufficient to support the verdicts.

### CONCLUSION

The evidence is sufficient to support the verdicts. Judgment affirmed.

NAJAM, J., and BARNES, J., concur.