IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41938

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	**2015 Unpublished Opinion No. 422**
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	**Filed: March 18, 2015**
	)	
v.	)	**Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk**
	)	
ROBERTO MORENO,	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Ronald J. Wilper, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of twenty-five years with a minimum period of confinement of seven years for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen and sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, affirmed.

John Prior, Nampa, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before MELANSON, Chief Judge; LANSING, Judge; and GUTIERREZ, Judge

PER CURIAM

Roberto Moreno was convicted of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, I.C. § 18-1506. The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of twenty-five years with seven years determinate. Moreno appeals, contending that the district court did not adequately explain its reasons for the sentences chosen and that his sentences are excessive.

Moreno's assertion that the district court erred when it failed to adequately specify the reasons underlying its sentencing determinations is without merit. Our appellate courts have many times stated that sentencing courts, although encouraged to do so, need not state their reasons for the imposition of particular sentences. *State v. Brewster*, 106 Idaho 145, 146, 676 P.2d 720, 721 (1984); *State v. Martinez*, 122 Idaho 158, 163, 832 P.2d 331, 336 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. King*, 120 Idaho 955, 958, 821 P.2d 1010, 1013 (Ct. App. 1991).

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (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). The issue presented to this Court is not whether the sentence is one that we would have imposed, but whether the sentence is plainly excessive under any reasonable view of the facts. *State v. Burdett*, 134 Idaho 271, 279, 1 P.3d 299, 307 (Ct. App. 2000). If reasonable minds might differ as to whether the sentence is excessive, this Court is not free to substitute its view for that of the trial court. *Id.* Having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Moreno's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.