

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46143

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: March 13, 2019**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**  
v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **FELICIA LYNETTE HARDY,** ) **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. Melissa Moody, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of five years, with minimum periods of confinement of 230 days, for forgery, grand theft, and burglary, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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 LORELLO, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Felicia Lynette Hardy was found guilty of forgery, I.C. § 18-3601; grand theft, I.C. § 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), and 18-2409; and burglary, I.C. § 18-1401. The district court sentenced Hardy to concurrent unified terms of five years, with minimum periods of confinement of 230 days. The district court ordered that Hardy’s sentences run consecutively to an unrelated sentence. Hardy appeals, arguing that her 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, Hardy's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.