

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JONATHAN GEILENFELDT,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

JONATHAN GEILENFELDT,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Respondent.

No. 90061-COA

FILED

JUL 30 2025

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY 

No. 90062-COA

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

Jonathan Geilenfeldt appeals from judgments of conviction, entered pursuant to guilty pleas, in two district court cases. Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County; Scott N. Freeman, Judge. Docket No. 90061 is an appeal from the judgment of conviction entered in district court case number CR24-1703 of burglary of a motor vehicle, first offense. Docket No. 90062 is an appeal from the judgment of conviction entered in district court case number CR24-1602 of burglary of a motor vehicle, first offense.

Geilenfeldt argues the district court abused its discretion by declining to suspend his prison sentence and allow him the opportunity to complete a Veterans Court program as a condition of probation. Geilenfeldt

25-33398


contends that comments by the district court suggest it relied on impalpable and highly suspect evidence in refusing to suspend his sentence.


The granting of probation or placement in a specialty court program in this case was discretionary. See NRS 176A.100(1)(c); NRS 176A.400(2); *Houk v. State*, 103 Nev. 659, 664, 747 P.2d 1376, 1379 (1987) (“The sentencing judge has wide discretion in imposing a sentence”). Generally, this court will not interfere with a sentence imposed by the district court that falls within the parameters of relevant sentencing statutes “[s]o long as the record does not demonstrate prejudice resulting from consideration of information or accusations founded on facts supported only by impalpable or highly suspect evidence.” *Silks v. State*, 92 Nev. 91, 94, 545 P.2d 1159, 1161 (1976); see *Cameron v. State*, 114 Nev. 1281, 1283, 968 P.2d 1169, 1171 (1998).

Geilenfeldt’s consecutive sentences of one to three years’ imprisonment are within the parameters provided by the relevant statutes. See NRS 193.130(2)(e); NRS 205.060(2)(a)(1); see also NRS 176.035(1). The district court considered Geilenfeldt’s criminal history, his statements, the mitigation presented, and the arguments of counsel before imposing sentence. Of particular concern to the court was the effect the crimes had on the victims and the fact that Geilenfeldt committed the instant offenses, as well as some past offenses, while supervised by pretrial services. We do not construe the statements Geilenfeldt highlights as suggesting the district court considered impalpable or highly suspect evidence. Instead, the statements acknowledge that the State’s arguments were more persuasive considering the evidence before the court. Having considered

the sentences and the crimes, we conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion by declining to suspend the sentences and allow Geilenfeldt the opportunity to complete a specialty court program as a condition of probation. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgments of conviction AFFIRMED.


_____, C.J.
Bulla


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Westbrook

cc: Hon. Scott N. Freeman, District Judge
Washoe County Public Defender
Attorney General/Carson City
Washoe County District Attorney
Washoe District Court Clerk