

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48171

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: February 24, 2021**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 WILLIAM EDWARD HARTMAN,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Minidoka County. Hon. Jonathan P. Brody, District Judge.

Order revoking probation and executing previously suspended sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

William Edward Hartman pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court sentenced Hartman to a unified seven-year sentence, with five years determinate, but after a period of retained jurisdiction, suspended the sentence and placed Hartman on probation. Subsequently, Hartman admitted to violating the terms of the probation and the district court revoked probation, but after a second period of retained jurisdiction, suspended the sentence and placed Hartman on probation. Once again, Hartman admitted to violating the terms of the probation. At the disposition hearing, the State recommended the district court revoke probation and execute the underlying suspended sentence and Hartman recommended the district court reinstate probation, retain jurisdiction, or reduce his sentence. The

district court revoked probation and ordered execution of the previously suspended sentence. Hartman filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Hartman appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation and executing the original sentence.

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 and are relevant to the defendant's contention that the trial court should have reduced the sentence upon revocation of probation. *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 Hartman's original suspended sentence. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Hartman's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.