IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41379

| STATE OF IDAHO, |) 2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 543 |
|-----------------------|--|
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) Filed: June 4, 2014 |
| v. |) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| RICHARD PAUL ISHAM, |)) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED) OPINION AND SHALL NOT |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. Cheri C. Copsey, District Judge.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction and executing unified sentence of five years, with two years determinate, <u>affirmed</u>.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly E. Smith, 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 GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Richard Paul Isham pled guilty to violation of a no contact order. Idaho Code § 18-920. The district court sentenced Isham to a unified term five years, with two years determinate, and retained jurisdiction. After a period of retained jurisdiction, the district court relinquished jurisdiction and executed the underlying sentence. Isham appeals, contending his sentence is excessive.

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, the order relinquishing jurisdiction and executing the underlying sentence is affirmed.