

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51388

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: September 23, 2024
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 KRISTY LINN MILLER,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Lamont C. Berecz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Kristy Linn Miller pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that she is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Miller to a unified term of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years. Miller filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Miller appeals, arguing that her sentence is excessive and that the district court should have retained jurisdiction.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020).

The primary purpose of a district court retaining jurisdiction is to enable the court to obtain additional information regarding whether the defendant has sufficient rehabilitative potential and is suitable for probation. *State v. Jones*, 141 Idaho 673, 677, 115 P.3d 764, 768 (Ct. App. 2005). Probation is the ultimate goal of retained jurisdiction. *Id.* There can be no abuse of discretion in declining to retain jurisdiction if the district court has sufficient evidence before it to conclude that the defendant is not a suitable candidate for probation. *Id.* The goal of probation is to foster the probationer's rehabilitation while protecting public safety. *State v. Cheatham*, 159 Idaho 856, 858, 367 P.3d 251, 253 (Ct. App. 2016). A decision to deny probation will not be deemed an abuse of discretion if it is consistent with the criteria articulated in I.C. § 19-2521.

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Miller's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.