

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48674

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: December 29, 2021**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 AARON WARREN MALM,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

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

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years for felony domestic battery, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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; GRATTON, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Aaron Warren Malm pled guilty to felony domestic battery, Idaho Code §§ 18-903, 18-918(2). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years with two and one-half years determinate. Malm appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by failing to retain jurisdiction.

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, 687 P.2d 583 (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.

Therefore, Malm's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.