

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 45217/45218

STATE OF IDAHO, ) 2018 Unpublished Opinion No. 330  
 )  
Plaintiff-Respondent, ) Filed: January 18, 2018  
 )  
v. ) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk  
 )  
ANITA MARIE TAYLOR, ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  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, Twin Falls County. Hon. Randy J. Stoker, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of life with eight years determinate for grand theft; two counts of forgery; criminal possession of a financial transaction card; possession of forged stolen notes, bank bills, or checks; and possession of amphetamine, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Maya P. Waldron, 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

Anita Marie Taylor pled guilty to grand theft (Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b)(1), 18-2409, 18-204), with a persistent violator enhancement (I.C. § 19-2514); two counts of forgery (I.C. § 18-3601); criminal possession of a financial transaction card (I.C. §§ 18-3125, 18-3128); possession of forged stolen notes, bank bills, or checks (I.C. § 18-3605); and possession of amphetamine (I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1)), with a persistent violator enhancement

(I.C. § 19-2514). The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of life with eight years determinate. Taylor appeals, contending that her 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, Taylor's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.