

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

AT NASHVILLE

AUGUST 1996 SESSION

FILED
October 8, 1996
Cecil W. Crowson
Appellate Court Clerk

STATE OF TENNESSEE,)
)
 Appellee,)
)
 VS.)
)
 LAVAUGHN DOUGLAS SCOTT and)
 HOWARD C. EVANS,)
)
 Appellants.)

C.C.A. NO. 01C01-9511-CC-00369

RUTHERFORD COUNTY

HON. JAMES K. CLAYTON, JR.,
JUDGE

(Possession of cocaine, possession
of marijuana, and possession of
drug paraphernalia)

FOR THE APPELLANTS:

FOR THE APPELLEE:

T. ARTHUR JENKINS
P. O. Box 126
Manchester, TN 37355

CHARLES W. BURSON
Attorney General & Reporter

KAREN M. YACUZZO
Asst. Attorney General
450 James Robertson Pkwy.
Nashville, TN 37243-0493

WILLIAM WHITESELL
District Attorney General
Judicial Bldg., 3rd Fl.
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

OPINION FILED: _____

AFFIRMED

JOHN H. PEAY,
Judge

OPINION

Both defendants were convicted at a jury trial of simple possession of cocaine, simple possession of marijuana, and possession of drug paraphernalia. The defendants were found not guilty on an additional charge of criminal trespass. For these misdemeanor convictions, each defendant received effective sentences of eleven months and twenty-nine days in the local workhouse. The defendant Scott's sentence was ordered to be served consecutively to a previous conviction in Williamson County. The sentence of the defendant Evans was fully suspended, and he was placed on probation. Fines were also assessed against each defendant in the total amount of one thousand dollars (\$1,000).

In this appeal as of right, the defendants present seven issues for review. Each of the allegations pertain to trial or sentencing issues. It is the defendant's duty to have prepared an adequate record in order to allow a meaningful review on appeal. T.R.A.P. 24(b); State v. Bunch, 646 S.W.2d 158, 160 (Tenn. 1983); State v. Roberts, 755 S.W.2d 833, 836 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1988). When no evidence is preserved in the record for review, we are precluded from considering the issue. Roberts, 755 S.W.2d at 836.

Since the defendants have failed to provide a transcript of the trial or the sentencing hearing, we are unable to consider their issues.

For the reason set forth above, the trial court is in all respects affirmed.

JOHN H. PEAY, Judge

CONCUR:

JOSEPH M. TIPTON, Judge

DAVID H. WELLES, Judge