

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 40611

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2013 Unpublished Opinion No. 613 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: August 1, 2013 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| DANNELL LLOYD MONTGOMERY, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |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. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for trafficking in methamphetamine, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGeevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Dannell Lloyd Montgomery pled guilty to trafficking in methamphetamine. I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(4). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges and an allegation that Montgomery was a persistent violator were dismissed. The district court sentenced Montgomery to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, to run concurrent with an unrelated sentence. Montgomery appeals.

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). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Montgomery's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.