

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51674

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: January 3, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
ANNECA SHARREL MAESTAS)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
VENEGAS,)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, for felony possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Devin E. Harris, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Anneca Sharrel Meastas Venegas pled guilty to felony possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). In exchange for her guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years. Venegas appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive and by denying her request to retain 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). That discretion includes the trial court's decision regarding whether a defendant should be placed on probation and whether to retain jurisdiction. I.C. § 19-2601(3), (4); *State v. Reber*, 138 Idaho 275, 278, 61 P.3d 632, 635 (Ct. App. 2002); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation/retaining jurisdiction was not appropriate.

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