

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45749

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: April 19, 2019</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>GREGORY CONAN WILLIAMS,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Melissa Moody, District Judge.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction and sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Gregory Conan Williams was found guilty of felony stalking in the first degree, Idaho Code § 18-7905. The district court imposed a unified five-year sentence, with three years determinate. The district court retained jurisdiction, and Williams was sent to participate in the rider program. After Williams completed his rider, the district court relinquished jurisdiction. Williams appeals, claiming that the district court erred by relinquishing jurisdiction. 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 Williams has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion in relinquishing jurisdiction.

Williams 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).

Williams 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 Williams's case. The record does not indicate that the district court abused its discretion in sentencing. The order of the district court relinquishing jurisdiction and Williams's sentence are affirmed.