

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41848

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2015 Unpublished Opinion No. 378
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: March 2, 2015
)
 v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
 WARREN HAROLD SHAW,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Lynn G. Norton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified fifteen-year sentence with five years determinate for felony domestic battery and concurrent five-year determinate term for intimidating or influencing a witness, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Warren Harold Shaw was convicted of felony domestic violence, Idaho Code §§ 18-903(a), 18-918(2); and intimidating, impeding, influencing, or preventing the attendance of a witness, I.C. § 18-2604, and was given persistent violator enhancements for both, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court imposed a unified fifteen-year sentence with five years determinate for felony domestic battery and a concurrent five-year determinate term for intimidating or influencing a witness, and retained jurisdiction. Upon Shaw's completion of retained jurisdiction, the district

court suspended Shaw's sentences and placed him on probation for fifteen years. Shaw appeals, contending that his underlying 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, Shaw's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.