

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46249

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: May 20, 2019**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **v.** )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **ABEL SANTIESTEBAN DUARTE,** ) **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. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of eight years with one and one-half-year determinate term for grand theft and three years with one and one-half-year determinate term for criminal possession of a financial transaction card, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Reed P. Anderson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Abel Santiesteban Duarte pled guilty to one count of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), 18-2409, and one count of criminal possession of a financial transaction card, I.C. §§ 18-3125, 18-3128. The district court imposed a unified eight-year sentence with one and one-half years determinate for grand theft and a concurrent unified sentence of three years with one and one-half years determinate for criminal possession of a financial transaction card. Duarte 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, Duarte's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.