

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-160376
	:	TRIAL NO. B-1506107
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
vs.	:	
JAMIE MONGHAN,	:	
	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant Jamie Monghan pleaded guilty to one count of robbery under R.C. 2911.02(A)(2). The trial court sentenced her to seven years' imprisonment, which was only one year less than the maximum term. In her sole assignment of error, Monghan contends that the sentence was excessive. She argues that the trial court did not correctly apply the sentencing statutes, and that the sentence was not supported by the record. This assignment of error is not well taken.

The sentence was within the statutory range for a second-degree felony. *See* R.C. 2929.14(A)(2). The record shows that the trial court specifically stated that it had considered the purposes and principles of sentencing and the various factors under R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12. *See State v. Alexander*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-110828 and C-110829, 2012-Ohio-3349, ¶ 23-24. While a trial court is required to consider all of the factors set forth in R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12, it need not make any

OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

specific findings. *State v. Bohannon*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-130014, 2013-Ohio-5101, ¶ 7.

Monghan essentially argues that the trial court did not consider the existence of substantial grounds for mitigation under R.C. 2929.12(C)(4). In particular, she argues that because she accepted responsibility for the offense and pleaded guilty as charged, a sentence at the lower or middle end of the sentencing range was appropriate. The record shows that the trial court heard Monghan's arguments in mitigation and that it considered them. It simply found the aggravating factors, such as Monghan's criminal record, lack of remorse, and violent history, to be more persuasive.

Monghan has not affirmatively demonstrated that the trial court did not consider the appropriate factors. *See id.* at ¶ 7-9. On the record before us, we cannot say that Monghan's sentence was clearly and convincingly contrary to law. *See State v. White*, 2013-Ohio-4225, 997 N.E.2d 629, ¶ 11 (1st Dist.). Consequently, we overrule her assignment of error and affirm the trial court's judgment.

A certified copy of this judgment entry constitutes the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

MOCK, P.J., ZAYAS and MYERS, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on March 8, 2017
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge