

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48845

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: February 23, 2022**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 CARL JOHN ANTONUCCI,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Valley County. Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Order revoking probation and directing execution of previously suspended sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

In 2013, Carl John Antonucci pled guilty to driving under the influence (third or subsequent offense). I.C. §§ 18-8004(1)(a), -8005(6). The district court sentenced Antonucci to a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, and placed him on probation. In 2021, Antonucci admitted to violating the terms of the probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation, ordered execution of the original sentence, and retained jurisdiction. Antonucci appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation rather than continuing probation with a term to attend residential treatment.

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.*

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, directing execution of Antonucci's previously suspended sentence, and retaining jurisdiction is affirmed.