## Cite as 2024 Ark. App. 109

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

**DIVISION IV** No. CR-23-56

Opinion Delivered	Feb	ruary	14,	2024
-------------------	-----	-------	-----	------

RICKIE NASH APPEAL FROM THE CRAIGHEAD

> COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, WESTERN **APPELLANT**

> > DISTRICT

[NO. 16JCR-19-1540]

HONORABLE CHRIS THYER.

**JUDGE** 

**AFFIRMED** 

V.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

**APPELLEE** 

## KENNETH S. HIXSON, Judge

This is a revocation case. On January 23, 2020, the trial court entered a sentencing order placing appellant Rickie Nash on five years' probation pursuant to Nash's negotiated plea of guilty to possession of methamphetamine. The conditions of Nash's probation required that he not commit a criminal offense punishable by imprisonment.

On April 6, 2022, the State filed a petition to revoke Nash's probation, alleging that he had violated the conditions of his probation by committing various drug-related offenses on March 17, 2022. On August 18, 2022, the State filed a supplemental revocation petition alleging that Nash possessed methamphetamine and drug paraphernalia on July 27, 2022.

After a revocation hearing held on October 6, 2022, the trial court found that Nash had violated the conditions of his probation. On the same day, the trial court entered an order revoking Nash's probation and sentencing him to six years in prison.

In this appeal, Nash's sole argument is that there was insufficient evidence to support the revocation. We note that today this court is also handing down *Nash v. State*, 2024 Ark. App. 108 (*Nash I*). In *Nash I*, Nash appealed from the revocation of a probation that was based on the same allegations, the same hearing, and the same evidence on which the revocation in the instant matter was premised. And the arguments raised herein challenging the sufficiency of the evidence are precisely the same arguments Nash made in *Nash I*. Finding sufficient evidence to support his revocation in *Nash I*, we affirmed the revocation in that case. In the present case, we affirm Nash's revocation for the same reasons we expressed in *Nash I*.

Affirmed.

HARRISON, C.J., and ABRAMSON, J., agree.

Terry Goodwin Jones, for appellant.

Tim Griffin, Att'y Gen., by: David L. Eanes, Jr., Ass't Att'y Gen., for appellee.