

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52679

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: April 15, 2026
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
CHRISTIN NOLAN HENSTOCK,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Eric J. Wildman, District Judge.

Order revoking probation, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kierra W. Mai, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Christin Nolan Henstock pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Henstock to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, and retained jurisdiction.¹ After the period of retained jurisdiction, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Henstock on probation. Subsequently, Henstock admitted to violating the terms of probation, and the district court continued Henstock on probation. Approximately three months later, the State alleged Henstock violated her probation. Henstock again admitted to violating the terms of probation, and the district court consequently revoked

¹ This sentence was ordered to run concurrently with Henstock’s sentence in a separate case.

probation and ordered execution of the original sentence. Henstock 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. *State v. Urrabazo*, 150 Idaho 158, 162, 244 P.3d 1244, 1248 (2010). 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 these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in either revoking probation or in ordering execution of Henstock's sentence. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Henstock's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.