

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43703

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 617
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: July 28, 2016
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
QUENTIN C. PADILLA,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Timothy Hansen, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years, for two counts of aggravated assault on certain law enforcement personnel, one count of possession of methamphetamine, one count of felony eluding a police officer, and one count of unlawful possession of a firearm, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Quentin C. Padilla pled guilty to two counts of aggravated assault on certain law enforcement personnel, Idaho Code § 18-915(1), 18-905; one count of possession of methamphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732(c); one count of felony eluding a police officer, I.C. § 49-1404(2)(a); and one count of unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316. In exchange for the guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed consecutive sentences of five years, with two years determinate, for each count of aggravated assault on

certain law enforcement personnel; five years indeterminate for possession of methamphetamine; five years, with three years determinate, for felony eluding a police officer; and five years indeterminate for unlawful possession of a firearm, resulting in an aggregate unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years. Padilla appeals, contending that his aggregate 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, Padilla's judgment of conviction and aggregate sentence are affirmed.