

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49312

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: August 9, 2022
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 JACQUILINE S. VALENZUELA,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Order revoking probation, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, 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

Jacqueline S. Valenzuela pled guilty to one count of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of drugs, Idaho Code §§ 18-8004, 18-8005(6), and one count of possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c). In exchange for her guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years with three years determinate for operating a motor vehicle while under the influence and a concurrent, unified sentence of seven years with three years determinate for possession of a controlled substance, but after a period of retained jurisdiction, suspended the sentences and placed Valenzuela on probation. Subsequently, Valenzuela admitted to violating the terms of the probation, and the district court consequently

revoked probation and ordered execution of the original sentences, giving Valenzuela credit for time served. Valenzuela filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of her sentences, which the district court denied. Valenzuela 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 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(4). 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 either in revoking probation or in ordering execution of Valenzuela's sentences. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Valenzuela's previously suspended sentences is affirmed.