

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45914

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: January 16, 2019
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
STEPHEN V. CROUSE,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Caribou County. Hon. Mitchell W. Brown, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for robbery and concurrent unified sentences of eight years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years, for two counts of aggravated battery, to run consecutive to the robbery sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Stephen V. Crouse pled guilty to robbery (Idaho Code §§ 18-6501, 18-6502) and two counts of aggravated battery (I.C. § 18-907). The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for robbery and unified sentences of eight years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years, for each of the aggravated battery convictions. The district court ordered the aggravated battery sentences to run

concurrently with each other but consecutively with the robbery sentence. Crouse 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, Crouse's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.