

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52730

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: February 17, 2026
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
CANDIS ANN SMITH,)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)	
_____)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Franklin County. Hon. Cody L. Brower, District Judge.

Order revoking probation and ordering executing of underlying sentence, affirmed.

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

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

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

PER CURIAM

Candis Ann Smith pleaded guilty to felony possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for her guilty plea. the State agreed to dismiss the persistent violator sentencing enhancement. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, suspended the sentence and placed Smith on probation. Subsequently, Smith admitted to violating terms of the probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation and ordered execution of the

original sentence.¹ Smith 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 has 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. I.C. § 19-2601(4). 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 the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation and ordering execution of Smith's sentence. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Smith's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.

¹ Smith filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. The denial of Smith's motion is not at issue on appeal.