

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43127

STATE OF IDAHO, ) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 315  
 )  
Plaintiff-Respondent, ) Filed: January 8, 2016  
 )  
v. ) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk  
 )  
DANIEL EPPS WILLIAMS, ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
 ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT  
Defendant-Appellant. ) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bingham County. Hon. Darren B. Simpson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and consecutive unified terms of twenty-five years, with minimum periods of confinement of nine years, for two counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, 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; GUTIERREZ, Judge;  
and GRATTON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Daniel Epps Williams pled guilty to two counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen. I.C. § 18-1506(1)(b). In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Williams to consecutive unified terms of twenty-five years, with minimum periods of confinement of nine years. Williams appeals.

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, Williams's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.