

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45315

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: August 13, 2018</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>DEREK JON SANDERS,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Robert C. Naftz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for criminal possession of a financial transaction card and twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, 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 HUSKEY, Judge

\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Derek Jon Sanders was found guilty of criminal possession of a financial transaction card, Idaho Code § 18-3125; grand theft, I.C. § 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1); and with being a persistent violator, I.C. 19-2514. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for criminal possession of a financial transaction card and twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for grand theft. Sanders 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, Sanders's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.