

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 44549

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2017 Unpublished Opinion No. 456 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: May 2, 2017 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| TOMMY CLAY ALEXANDER, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |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. Samuel A. Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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; MELANSON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Tommy Clay Alexander pleaded guilty to possession of a controlled substance, felony, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). The district court imposed unified seven-year sentence, with one and one-half years determinate. Alexander 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, Alexander's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.