

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 40846

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2013 Unpublished Opinion No. 779
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	<b>Filed: December 6, 2013</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk</b>
	)	
CYNCLAIRE LAMARR WOODS,	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
	)	

---

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 years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for two counts of aggravated battery and concurrent unified sentence of ten years with five years determinate for aggravated assault, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before LANSING, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;  
and MELANSON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Cynclaire Lamarr Woods was found guilty of two counts of aggravated battery, Idaho Code § 18-903(a), 18-907(b); and one count of aggravated assault, I.C. § 18-901(b), 18-905(a). The district court sentenced Woods to concurrent unified sentences of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for two counts of aggravated battery and concurrent unified sentence of ten years with five years determinate for aggravated assault. Woods appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

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, Woods' judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.