

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 42297

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2015 Unpublished Opinion No. 492
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: May 15, 2015
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
DONALD RAYMOND SMITH,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Fred M. Gibler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified fourteen-year sentence with a minimum period of confinement of two years for grand theft, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly E. Smith, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Donald Raymond Smith was found guilty of grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1), with a persistent violator enhancement. The district court imposed a unified fourteen-year sentence with a minimum period of confinement of two years. Smith appeals, contending that 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, Smith's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.