

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ANGELA DEE CEDERSTROM, A/K/A  
ANGELA DIXON, A/K/A BRENDA LEE  
CARR,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 76141-COA

**FILED**

FEB 12 2019

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY   
DEPUTY CLERK

ANGELA DEE CEDERSTROM, A/K/A  
ANGELA DIXON, A/K/A BRENDA LEE  
CARR,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 76142-COA

ANGELA DEE CEDERSTROM, A/K/A  
ANGELA DIXON, A/K/A BRENDA LEE  
CARR,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
THE STATE OF NEVADA,  
Respondent.

No. 76143-COA

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Angela Dee Cederstrom appeals from district court orders revoking probation in district court case numbers CR-FO-14-1407 (Docket No. 76141-COA), CR-FP-15-1579 (Docket No. 76142-COA), and CR-FP-14-1019 (Docket No. 76143-COA). We elect to consolidate these appeals for

dispositional purposes. See NRAP 3(b)(2). Fourth Judicial District Court, Elko County; Nancy L. Porter, Judge.

Cederstrom argues the district court abused its discretion by revoking her probation and imposing the original suspended sentence for each of her convictions. Cederstrom asserts the district court should have granted her request to reduce her jail sentences because she had performed reasonably well in mental health court and took accountability for her actions.

The decision to revoke probation is within the broad discretion of the district court and will not be disturbed absent a clear showing of abuse. *Lewis v. State*, 90 Nev. 436, 438, 529 P.2d 796, 797 (1974). NRS 176A.630 grants the district court broad discretion in determining the appropriate treatment of a probationer who violates the terms of probation and the district court may properly cause the original sentence to be executed or modify the original sentence. We will not interfere with a sentence imposed by the district court “[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).

At the revocation hearing concerning all three cases, Cederstrom acknowledged she violated the terms of her probation and the district court revoked her probation for each case. Cederstrom requested the district court to modify her sentences so that she would face no additional jail time given her lengthy time spent with the mental health court, but the district court denied that request and imposed the original jail sentences. Cederstrom does not allege the district court considered impalpable or highly suspect evidence when imposing sentence, and we

conclude Cederstrom has not demonstrated the district court abused its discretion by declining to impose reduced sentences pursuant to NRS 176A.630. Therefore, Cederstrom is not entitled to relief and we

ORDER the judgments of the district court AFFIRMED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_, A.C.J.  
Douglas

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Gibbons

cc: Hon. Nancy L. Porter, District Judge  
Elko County Public Defender  
Attorney General/Carson City  
Elko County District Attorney  
Elko County Clerk