

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 44390

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2017 Unpublished Opinion No. 461 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: May 12, 2017 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| JERIMEE RYAN SEAMANS, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |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. Steven J. Hippler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Jerimee Ryan Seamans pleaded guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), -2407(1)(b), -2409. The district court imposed a unified twelve-year sentence, with three years determinate. Seamans 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, Seamans' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.