

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 44664

STATE OF IDAHO, ) 2017 Unpublished Opinion No. 469  
 )  
Plaintiff-Respondent, ) Filed: May 23, 2017  
 )  
v. ) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk  
 )  
MAURICIO LARA-MEDINA, aka ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
VICTOR URIARTE GONZALEZ, ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT  
 ) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY  
Defendant-Appellant. )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael Reardon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for one count of possession of a controlled substance and one count of felony DUI; and 180-day jail sentence for injury to children, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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

Mauricio Lara-Medina pled guilty to one count of possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c); one count of felony operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, I.C. §§ 18-8004, 18-8005(9); and one count of injury to children, I.C. § 18-1501(1). The district court sentenced Lara-Medina to concurrent unified sentences of seven years with three years determinate for possession of a controlled substance and felony DUI charges, and 180-day jail sentence for injury to children. Lara-Medina appeals

asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing and executing his sentences. He contends that sufficient consideration of the facts of this case reveals that suspended sentences would better serve the goals of sentencing.

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, Lara-Medina's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.