## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 48253**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
Plaintiff-Respondent,	<ul><li>) Filed: March 31, 2021</li><li>)</li><li>) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</li></ul>
<b>v.</b>	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
AUSTIN SAMUEL BYRON,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)
Annual from the District Count	of the Savanth Judicial District State of

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Bruce L. Pickett, District Judge.

Order revoking probation, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Emily M. Joyce, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Justin R. Porter, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Austin Samuel Byron pled guilty to felony domestic battery. Idaho Code § 18-918(2)(a). The district court sentenced Byron to a unified term of ten years with two years determinate, suspended the sentence and placed Byron on probation for a period of five years. As a condition of his probation, the court required Byron to successfully complete domestic violence court. Shortly thereafter, the domestic violence court suspended Byron from participation for failure to comply with its terms and conditions. Subsequently, Byron was found to have violated the terms of his probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation, ordered execution of the original sentence. Byron appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation.

It is within the trial court's discretion to revoke probation if any of the terms and conditions of the probation has 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*.

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Byron's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.