

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45894

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: October 22, 2018</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>WILLIAM KARYIM HAMMOND,</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. Stephen S. Dunn, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for discharge of a firearm at an occupied vehicle, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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

William Karyim Hammond pled guilty to discharge of a firearm at an occupied vehicle, Idaho Code § 18-3317. The district court imposed a unified sentence of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, and retained jurisdiction. Hammond appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive and that the district court abused its discretion by retaining jurisdiction rather than granting his request for probation.

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, Hammond's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.