

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45494

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: June 26, 2018**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **RICKY TARSHA,**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed; order relinquishing jurisdiction, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Ricky Tarsha was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c). The district court sentenced Tarsha to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years. The district court retained jurisdiction, and Tarsha was sent to participate in the rider program.

After Tarsha completed his rider, the district court relinquished jurisdiction. Tarsha appeals, claiming that the district court erred by refusing to grant probation. He also argues his sentence is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

We note that the decision to place a defendant on probation or whether, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction over the defendant is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that Tarsha has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion in relinquishing jurisdiction.

Tarsha also contends that his sentence is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion. Sentences are reviewed for an abuse of discretion. Our appellate standard of review and the factors to be considered when evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well-established. *State v. Burdett*, 134 Idaho 271, 1 P.3d 299 (Ct. App. 2000); *State v. Sanchez*, 115 Idaho 776, 769 P.2d 1148 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Reinke*, 103 Idaho 771, 653 P.2d 1183 (Ct. App. 1982); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 650 P.2d 707 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007).

Tarsha argues that all of the relevant goals of sentencing could have been accomplished with probation. As noted above, however, the district court found that probation was not an appropriate course of action in Tarsha's case. The record does not indicate that the district court abused its discretion in sentencing.

The judgment of conviction and sentence of a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, and the order of the district court relinquishing jurisdiction are affirmed.