IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53048

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: November 4, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
HAYDEN ALLEN,	)	**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. Steven J. Hippler and Cheri C. Copsey, District Judges.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction, 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; LORELLO Judge;
and FLEMING, Judge

PER CURIAM

Hayden Allen pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court sentenced Allen to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years. The district court retained jurisdiction, and Allen was sent to participate in the rider program.

After Allen completed his rider, the district court relinquished jurisdiction. Allen appeals, claiming that the district court erred by refusing to grant probation. He also argues his sentence is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

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). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that Allen has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion in relinquishing jurisdiction.

Allen also contends that his sentence is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion. Sentences are reviewed for an abuse of discretion. Our appellate standard of review and the factors to be considered when evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well-established. *State v. Burdett*, 134 Idaho 271, 1 P.3d 299 (Ct. App. 2000); *State v. Sanchez*, 115 Idaho 776, 769 P.2d 1148 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Reinke*, 103 Idaho 771, 653 P.2d 1183 (Ct. App. 1982); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 650 P.2d 707 (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).

Allen argues that all 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 Allen'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 Allen's sentence are affirmed.