

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41433

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 717
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: September 10, 2014
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
JON RAFEAL WOODS,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twelve years with three years determinate for trafficking in cocaine and trafficking in marijuana, five years with two years determinate on each count of delivery of a controlled substance, thirty days in jail for misdemeanor driving without privileges, and thirty days in jail for misdemeanor possession of drug paraphernalia, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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

Jon Rafeal Woods was convicted of one count of trafficking in cocaine, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(2); one count of trafficking in marijuana, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(1); two counts of delivery of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(a); one count of misdemeanor driving without privileges, I.C. § 18-8001(3); and one count of misdemeanor possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A. The district court imposed two unified sentences of twelve years with three years determinate for trafficking in cocaine and trafficking in marijuana, unified sentences of

five years with two years determinate on each count of delivery of a controlled substance, and thirty days in jail on each of the misdemeanors, with all sentences to run concurrently. Woods appeals, contending that his sentences are 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, Woods's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.