

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46687

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: October 16, 2019**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **NICHOLAS WILLIAM SHUFF,**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Lansing Haynes, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years with a two-year determinate term for grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenevieve C. Swinford, 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; LORELLO, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Nicholas William Shuff pled guilty to one count of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b)(1). The district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence with a two-year determinate term. Shuff appeals, contending that the district court erred in failing to retain jurisdiction and that the sentence is excessive.

The primary purpose of the retained jurisdiction program is to enable the trial court to obtain additional information regarding the defendant's rehabilitative potential and suitability for probation, and probation is the ultimate objective of a defendant who is on retained jurisdiction. *State v. Chapel*, 107 Idaho 193, 194, 687 P.2d 583, 584 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103

Idaho 565, 567, 650 P.2d 707, 709 (Ct. App. 1982). There can be no abuse of discretion in a trial court's refusal to retain jurisdiction if the court already has sufficient information upon which to conclude that the defendant is not a suitable candidate for probation. *State v. Beebe*, 113 Idaho 977, 979, 751 P.2d 673, 675 (Ct. App. 1988); *Toohill*, 103 Idaho at 567, 650 P.2d at 709. Based upon the information that was before the district court at the time of sentencing, we hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it declined to retain jurisdiction in this case.

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); *Toohill*, 103 Idaho at 568, 650 P.2d at 710. 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).

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