

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

*State of Idaho v. Jason E. Martin*

Docket No. 50218

Jason E. Martin pleaded guilty to felony operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol (third offense in ten years). The district court imposed a unified sentence of nine years, with three years determinate, and retained jurisdiction. Thereafter, a jurisdictional review hearing was held. At the hearing, both the State and Martin recommended Martin be placed on probation; the addendum to the presentence investigation report (APSI) also recommended probation. Despite these recommendations, the district court relinquished jurisdiction over Martin.

On appeal, Martin alleges the court failed to exercise reason in reaching its decision to relinquish jurisdiction because the court lacked sufficient information to determine that probation was inappropriate in light of the information that Martin performed well on his period of retained jurisdiction, and Idaho Department of Correction, the State, and Martin recommended probation.

The Court of Appeals held that the information considered by the district court is sufficient for the district court to determine whether to place a defendant on probation or relinquish jurisdiction. The district court considered the guidelines set forth in I.C. § 19-2521, including the goals of sentencing, protection of the public and society, deterrence, rehabilitation, and punishment. The district court also considered the underlying criminal file, including the presentence investigation report, and the updated information contained in the APSI. Thus, the district court had sufficient information to conclude that Martin was not a suitable candidate for probation and did not err in relinquishing jurisdiction.

*This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.*