

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 46110/46111

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: August 28, 2019
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
RICHARD DRENNON,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for three counts of forgery, affirmed; consecutive unified sentence of eight years with four years determinate 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; LORELLO, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

In docket number 46110, Richard Drennon was found guilty of three counts of forgery. Idaho Code § 18-3601. In docket number 46111, Drennon was found guilty of grand theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), 18-2409. At a consolidated sentencing hearing, the district court sentenced Drennon to concurrent unified sentences of four years with two years determinate on each of the three counts of forgery and a consecutive unified sentence of eight years with four years determinate for grand theft. Drennon appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

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, Drennon's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.