

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50595

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: February 5, 2024
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JEREMY WAYNE FEASEL,) 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. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Jeremy Wayne Feasel pled guilty to felony domestic battery. I.C. §§ 18-918(2), 18-903(a), and 18-918(4). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Feasel to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. The district court retained jurisdiction, and Feasel was sent to participate in the rider program.

At the conclusion of Feasel’s rider, the jurisdictional review committee recommended that he be placed on probation. At the jurisdictional review hearing, the district court reminded Feasel that it had only retained jurisdiction for evaluative purposes in order for him to begin treatment

and relinquished jurisdiction. Feasel appeals, claiming that the district court erred by refusing to grant probation.

The decision to place a defendant on probation or whether, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction over the defendant is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). A district court's decision to relinquish jurisdiction will not be deemed an abuse of discretion if the trial court has sufficient information to determine that a suspended sentence and probation would be inappropriate. *State v. Statton*, 136 Idaho 135, 137, 30 P.3d 290, 292 (2001). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate.

Feasel argues that all of the relevant goals of sentencing could have been accomplished with probation. As noted above, however, the district court found that probation was not an appropriate course of action in Feasel's case. The record does not indicate that the district court abused its discretion in sentencing.

The order of the district court relinquishing jurisdiction and Feasel's sentence are affirmed.