IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 1-915 / 01-0540
Filed December 28, 2001

STATE OF IOWA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

vs.

ALONZO JAMAL HENDERSON,
Defendant-Appellant.

FILED
DEC 28 2001
CLERK SUPREME COURT

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Black Hawk County, James D. Coil, District Associate Judge.

Alonzo Henderson alleges the district court erred in failing to provide sufficient reasons for a consecutive sentence. **AFFIRMED.**

Linda Del Gallo, State Appellate Defender, and Theresa Wilson, Assistant Appellate Defender, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and Donald Stanley, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee.

Considered by Sackett, C.J., and Mahan and Hecht, JJ.

000643

MAHAN, J.

Alonzo Henderson alleges the district court erred in failing to provide sufficient reasons for a consecutive sentence. We affirm.

I. Background Facts and Proceedings.

A jury returned a verdict on February 8, 2001, finding Henderson guilty of assault domestic abuse causing bodily injury, a serious misdemeanor in violation of Iowa Code section 708.2A(2)(b) (1999). The court held a sentencing hearing on March 5, 2001.

The State recommended that Henderson receive a sentence of one year in jail with all but fifteen days suspended; one year of supervised probation; a $250 fine plus surcharge and court costs; and completion of the Batterer's Education Program. The State further recommended that this sentence run consecutive to any others based upon Henderson's extensive criminal history. In support thereof the State recited the following previous convictions: (1) an assault conviction in 1992; (2) an assault with injury conviction in 1992; (3) a sale or manufacturing of crack cocaine conviction in 1993; (4) a drug stamp conviction in 1993; (5) an improper labeling of prescription drugs conviction in 1993; (6) a sale or manufacturing of marijuana conviction in 1993; (7) an interference with official acts conviction in 1993; and (8) an interference with official acts conviction in 2000.

Henderson agreed with the State's sentencing recommendation with the exception of the request for a consecutive sentence. In addition, Henderson did not take issue with the presentence investigation report.

The district court, in sentencing Henderson, stated:

> Next, I have ordered that you are to be incarcerated in the Black Hawk County Jail for a period of 365 days. I have ordered that this sentence is run consecutive to the sentences for which you are presently on parole, and I have suspended the sentence with the exception of 15 days which I have ordered that you are to commence serving immediately.
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . [T]he sentence is appropriate in this instance based upon the nature and circumstances of the offense as well as your prior record.

Henderson appeals.

II. Consecutive Sentence.

Our review is for abuse of discretion. *State v. Sandifer*, 570 N.W.2d 256, 257 (Iowa Ct. App. 1997).

The district court is required to state on the record its reasons for selecting a particular sentence in a criminal case. Iowa R. Crim. P. 22(3)(d). This requirement extends to the need to provide an explanation for imposing a consecutive sentence. *See State v. Delaney*, 526 N.W.2d 170, 178 (Iowa Ct. App. 1994). The reasons for a consecutive sentence however need not "be specifically tied to the imposition of consecutive sentences, but may be found from the particular reasons expressed for the overall sentencing plan." *Id.* Thus, we may look to all parts of the sentencing record to find supporting reasons. *State v. Johnson*, 445 N.W.2d 337, 343 (Iowa 1989). The reasons need not be detailed, but the explanation must be enough to allow our review of the district court's discretionary actions. *Id.*

Henderson alleges the district court failed to provide sufficient reasons for the consecutive sentence in this case. We disagree.

We note, first of all, that the only contested issue at sentencing was the State's request for a consecutive sentence. Henderson agreed to all of the State's other requests. Thus, the court's sole focus was the issue of a concurrent or consecutive sentence. The district court imposed a consecutive sentence and stated said sentence was appropriate based upon "the nature and circumstances of the offense as well as your prior record." Henderson's eight prior convictions had been placed on the record by the State. We agree that the reasons stated were brief, but they do not "handicap our review of the sentencing discretion." *State v. Carberry*, 501 N.W.2d 473, 478 (Iowa 1993). The reasons stated certainly give us a "clue" to the court's reasoning. *State v. Uthe*, 542 N.W.2d 810, 816 (Iowa 1996). Henderson's "prior record" included eight convictions. We conclude the district court properly exercised its discretion in imposing a consecutive sentence in this case. Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.

000613