

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

Nos. 124,158  
124,159

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

STATE OF KANSAS,  
*Appellee,*

v.

DANIELLE N. ALLISTON,  
*Appellant.*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appeal from Jackson District Court; NORBERT C. MAREK JR., judge. Opinion filed April 15, 2022. Appeal dismissed.

Submitted by the parties for summary disposition pursuant to K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 21-6820(g) and (h).

Before MALONE, P.J., SCHROEDER and HURST, JJ.

PER CURIAM: Danielle N. Alliston was convicted of possession of heroin in two separate district court cases. At the combined sentencing hearing, the district court denied Alliston's motion for downward durational departure and imposed the presumptive grid box sentence of 20 months' imprisonment in each case, to run concurrent, with 12 months' postrelease supervision, consecutive to Alliston's sentence for a misdemeanor conviction in another case. See K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 21-6805(a) (sentencing guidelines grid for drug crimes). The misdemeanor case is not at issue in this appeal. Alliston's two cases were consolidated on appeal, and we granted Alliston's motion for summary disposition in lieu of briefs under Supreme Court Rule 7.041A (2022 Kan. S. Ct. R. at 48).

Alliston asserts the district court erred in denying her departure motion and in imposing the standard grid sentence over the mitigated sentence as set out in the grid box, but she concedes we do not have jurisdiction to review the imposition of a presumptive sentence. See K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 21-6820(c)(1). Alliston further asserts the district court erred in ordering her present sentences be served consecutively to her sentence in another case. But, she likewise acknowledges we do not have jurisdiction to review this point. See *State v. Young*, 313 Kan. 724, 740, 490 P.3d 1183 (2021) (appellate court lacks jurisdiction to review imposition of consecutive sentences when such disposition is authorized by statute).

Upon review of the record, even if we did have jurisdiction to address Alliston's issues on appeal, she has failed to show the district court abused its discretion.

Given the controlling precedent, we have no jurisdiction to consider Alliston's claims; therefore, we dismiss her appeal.

Appeal dismissed.