

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 43993/43994

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 763
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: November 4, 2016
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
LUIS FRANCISCO RAZO-GONZALEZ,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Jerome County. Hon. John K. Butler, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and unified sentence of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, for possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, and consecutive unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for battery with intent to commit a serious felony, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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 HUSKEY, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

In Docket No. 43993, Luis Francisco Razo-Gonzalez pleaded guilty to possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of three years, with one year determinate, suspended the sentence, and placed Razo-Gonzalez on a term of probation. Subsequently, Razo-Gonzalez violated the terms of his probation and the district court revoked probation and executed the underlying sentence. In Docket No. 43994, Razo-Gonzalez pleaded guilty to battery with intent to commit a serious felony, I.C. §§ 18-903, -911, and the district court imposed a consecutive, unified

sentence of fifteen years, with two years determinate. Razo-Gonzalez 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 these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Razo-Gonzalez's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.