

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46644

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: September 3, 2019</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>JT JOHNSON,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Cassia County. Hon. Michael P. Tribe, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, suspended, and jurisdiction retained, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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 LORELLO, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

JT Johnson pleaded guilty to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court imposed a unified five-year sentence, with two years determinate, suspended the sentence, and retained jurisdiction. Johnson appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by not placing Johnson on probation.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court’s discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). That discretion includes the trial court's decision regarding whether a defendant should be placed on probation and whether to retain jurisdiction. I.C. § 19-2601(3); *State v. Reber*, 138 Idaho 275, 278, 61 P.3d 632, 635 (Ct. App. 2002); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 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 Johnson has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion when imposing sentence.

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Johnson's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.