

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

| | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|
| STATE OF OHIO, | : | APPEAL NOS. C-170235 |
| | | C-170236 |
| Plaintiff-Appellee, | : | TRIAL NOS. B-1405911-B |
| | | B-1500983 |
| vs. | : | |
| HENDRICK BRADLEY, | : | <i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i> |
| Defendant-Appellant. | : | |

We consider these consolidated appeals 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); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant Hendrick Bradley appeals from the trial court's judgments imposing consecutive prison terms after terminating the community-control sanctions originally imposed for two separate heroin-trafficking offenses committed in Hamilton County.

While still under the community-control sanctions, Bradley was convicted of aggravated drug possession in Richland County, Ohio. In Hamilton County Common Pleas Court, Bradley waived a probable-cause determination and entered no-contest pleas to violating community control. After a hearing, the trial court terminated the community-control sanctions and imposed a 12-month prison term for violating the community control related to each of the two heroin-trafficking offenses. The court ordered the two prison terms to be served concurrently with each other but consecutively to the prison term that Bradley was already serving for the Richland County conviction.

While Bradley's sole assignment of error provides that the trial court erred by failing "to expressly make" the findings required to impose consecutive sentences under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4), the gravamen of his argument is the findings that the trial court actually made were not supported in the record because Bradley had committed only victimless crimes and because he had enrolled in addiction-treatment programs while in custody awaiting sentencing.

Here, the trial court expressly stated the findings necessary to support consecutive sentences during the sentencing hearing, and incorporated those findings into the sentencing entries as required by *State v. Bonnell*, 140 Ohio St.3d 209, 2014-Ohio-3177, 16 N.E.3d 659. The record of Bradley's crimes amply supports the trial court's findings that consecutive sentences were necessary to protect the public in light of Bradley's commission of multiple drug-trafficking offenses and his subsequent, Richland County offense, committed while he was on community control. Thus we will not modify or vacate the sentences imposed. *See* R.C. 2953.08(G)(2)(a); *see also State v. Sanders*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-140579, 2015-Ohio-5232, ¶ 54. The assignment of error is overruled.

Therefore, we affirm the trial court's judgments.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on February 9, 2018
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge