

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45531

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: July 26, 2018**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
AARON M. ALEXANDROVICH,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for sexual abuse of a child under sixteen, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, 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

Aaron M. Alexandrovich pleaded guilty to sexual abuse of a child under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1506. The district court imposed a unified life sentence, with six years determinate. Alexandrovich filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion to correct an illegal sentence. The district court granted the motion and modified Alexandrovich's sentence to a unified twenty-five year sentence, with six years determinate. Alexandrovich 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, Alexandrovich's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.