

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46815

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	<b>Filed: November 15, 2019</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)	
	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>JOHN WILLIAM BOWKER,</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. Jonathan Medema, District Judge.

Order revoking probation, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

John William Bowker pled guilty to domestic battery, Idaho Code §§ 18-903(a), 18-918(3); possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c); and resisting and/or obstructing an officer, I.C. § 18-705. After Bowker entered his guilty pleas, but prior to sentencing, Bowker was charged with violating a no-contact order, possession of marijuana, and possession of drug paraphernalia. The district court sentenced Bowker to a unified term of seven years with two years determinate and retained jurisdiction on the possession of a controlled substance charge, and to concurrent jail time on the other two charges. Following the period of retained jurisdiction, the district court suspended Bowker’s sentence and placed him on probation for seven years. Subsequently, Bowker was found to have violated the terms of the probation, and

the district court consequently revoked probation and ordered execution of the original sentence. Bowker appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by revoking probation and not placing him on a second term of probation.

It is within the trial court's discretion to revoke probation if any of the terms and conditions of the probation have been violated. I.C. §§ 19-2603, 20-222; *State v. Beckett*, 122 Idaho 324, 325, 834 P.2d 326, 327 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Adams*, 115 Idaho 1053, 1054, 772 P.2d 260, 261 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Hass*, 114 Idaho 554, 558, 758 P.2d 713, 717 (Ct. App. 1988). In determining whether to revoke probation a court must examine whether the probation is achieving the goal of rehabilitation and consistent with the protection of society. *State v. Upton*, 127 Idaho 274, 275, 899 P.2d 984, 985 (Ct. App. 1995); *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *Hass*, 114 Idaho at 558, 758 P.2d at 717. The court may, after a probation violation has been established, order that the suspended sentence be executed or, in the alternative, the court is authorized under I.C.R. 35 to reduce the sentence. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *State v. Marks*, 116 Idaho 976, 977, 783 P.2d 315, 316 (Ct. App. 1989). The court may also order a period of retained jurisdiction. I.C. § 19-2601. A decision to revoke probation will be disturbed on appeal only upon a showing that the trial court abused its discretion. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327. In reviewing the propriety of a probation revocation, the focus of the inquiry is the conduct underlying the trial court's decision to revoke probation. *State v. Morgan*, 153 Idaho 618, 621, 288 P.3d 835, 838 (Ct. App. 2012). Thus, this Court will consider the elements of the record before the trial court relevant to the revocation of probation issues which are properly made part of the record on appeal. *Id.*

When we review a sentence that is ordered into execution following a period of probation, we will examine the entire record encompassing events before and after the original judgment. *State v. Hanington*, 148 Idaho 26, 29, 218 P.3d 5, 8 (Ct. App. 2009). We base our review upon the facts existing when the sentence was imposed as well as events occurring between the original sentencing and the revocation of probation. *Id.* Thus, this Court will consider the elements of the record before the trial court that are properly made part of the record on appeal. *Morgan*, 153 Idaho at 621, 288 P.3d at 838.

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion either in revoking probation or in ordering

execution of Bowker's sentence. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Bowker's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.