

IDAHO COURT OF APPEALS

State v. Slinkard

Slinkard · No. 52113 · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The Idaho Court of Appeals affirmed Cordelle Anthony Jameson Slinkard’s convictions for five counts of unlawful possession of a firearm. The court held that a felony forgery conviction resulting in supervised probation qualifies as a prior felony conviction under Idaho Code § 18-3316, even though forgery is not among the specifically listed offenses in § 18-310(2). The court also affirmed the denial of Slinkard’s Idaho Criminal Rule 29 motion for judgment of acquittal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Idaho Court of Appeals
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Huskey, Judge; Gratton, Chief Judge; Lorello, Judge
JURISDICTION	Idaho Court of Appeals
DECIDED	December 18, 2025
DOCKET	52113
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Slinkard appealed from a judgment of conviction for five counts of unlawful possession of a firearm, challenging the denial of his Idaho Criminal Rule 29 motion for judgment of acquittal.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The appellate court independently considers the evidence in the record and determines whether a reasonable mind could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's guilt as to the material elements of the offense was proven. Statutory interpretation is reviewed de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Cordelle Anthony Jameson Slinkard v. State of Idaho

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- statutory interpretation
- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- preservation of error

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a defendant on supervised probation following a withheld judgment for felony forgery is a person previously convicted of a felony under Idaho Code section 18-3316.
2. Whether Idaho Code section 18-3316's reference to crimes enumerated in Idaho Code section 18-310 is limited to the specifically listed offenses in section 18-310(2), or encompasses the general category of felonies addressed in section 18-310(1).
3. Whether the district court properly denied Slinkard's Idaho Criminal Rule 29 motion for judgment of acquittal.

HOLDINGS

1. A defendant who received a withheld judgment for felony forgery and was on supervised felony probation is 'convicted of a felony' for purposes of Idaho Code section 18-3316, and is prohibited from possessing firearms until final discharge and restoration of firearm rights.
2. The reference to crimes enumerated in Idaho Code section 18-310 encompasses the entire statute, not merely the specifically listed offenses in section 18-310(2).
3. The district court properly denied Slinkard's motion for judgment of acquittal because the record contained sufficient evidence from which a reasonable jury could find beyond a reasonable doubt that he was a convicted felon unlawfully possessing firearms.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We hold that under the plain language of I.C. § 18-3316, Slinkard was “convicted of a felony” because at the time of the offenses in this case, Slinkard was on supervised probation for forgery, a felony included in the category of crimes encompassed within I.C. § 18-310, which prohibits the possession of firearms until final discharge.” (at 7)

“Therefore, the comment to ICJI 1403 does not change the analysis or outcome in this case.” (at 8)

“We agree with the district court’s determination that there was sufficient information in the record to hold that a reasonable jury could conclude Slinkard was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of being a felon in possession of a firearm on August 7, 2023.” (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Slinkard pleaded guilty to felony forgery, received a withheld judgment, and was placed on supervised probation. During a probation compliance check, officers searched a vehicle associated with Slinkard and found five firearms, along with identifying documents and equipment linking the vehicle and firearms to him. His felony probation had not ended and his firearm rights had not been restored when the firearms were discovered.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Slinkard pleaded guilty to felony forgery and received a withheld judgment followed by two years of supervised probation. After firearms were found in a vehicle associated with him, he was charged with five counts of unlawful possession of a firearm and proceeded to a jury trial. The district court denied his Rule 29 motion, the jury found him guilty on all counts, and the Idaho Court of Appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Mercer, 143 Idaho 108, 109, 138 P.3d 308, 309 (2006)
- State v. Reyes, 139 Idaho 502, 505, 80 P.3d 1103, 1106 (Ct. App. 2003)
- State v. Burnight, 132 Idaho 654, 659, 978 P.2d 214, 219 (1999)
- State v. Escobar, 134 Idaho 387, 389, 3 P.3d 65, 67 (Ct. App. 2000)
- State v. Beard, 135 Idaho 641, 646, 22 P.3d 116, 121 (Ct. App. 2001)
- State v. Doe, 140 Idaho 271, 275, 92 P.3d 521, 525 (2004)
- United States v. Sharp, 145 Idaho 403, 179 P.3d 1059 (2008)
- State v. Cook, 143 Idaho 323, 144 P.3d 28 (Ct. App. 2006)
- Zivkovic v. State, 150 Idaho 783, 787-88, 251 P.3d 611, 615-16 (Ct. App. 2011)
- State v. Burke, 166 Idaho 621, 623, 462 P.3d 599, 601 (2020)
- State v. Castrejon, 163 Idaho 19, 24, 407 P.3d 606, 611 (Ct. App. 2017)
- State v. Boren, 156 Idaho 498, 328 P.3d 478 (2014)
- Peltier v. State, 119 Idaho 454, 460, 808 P.2d 373, 379 (1991)
- State v. Bodenbach, 165 Idaho 577, 586, 448 P.3d 1005, 1014 (2019)