

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45080

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2018 Unpublished Opinion No. 380
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: March 7, 2018
)
v.) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
)
SPENCER ALEXANDER JARRETT,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Thomas J. Ryan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen and ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for each of two counts of possession of sexually exploitative material, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Reed P. Anderson, 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; GUTIERREZ, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Spencer Alexander Jarrett was found guilty of one count of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1506, and two counts of possession of sexually exploitative material, I.C. § 18-1506. The district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for sexual abuse and concurrent unified sentences of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for each of the possession

counts, to run concurrently with the sentence for sexual abuse. Jarrett 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 this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Jarrett's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.