

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 46278/46279

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: May 3, 2019**
)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgments of convictions and unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for grand theft, unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for burglary, unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for grand theft, and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for aggravated assault, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

In Docket No. 46279, Jerrick James Engler pleaded guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1), and burglary, I.C. § 18-1401, and the district court imposed a unified fourteen-year sentence, with three years determinate, and a unified ten-year sentence, with three years determinate, respectively. The sentences were ordered to run concurrently. In Docket No. 46278, Jerrick pleaded guilty to grand theft, I.C. § 18-2403(1)(F), and aggravated assault,

I.C. § 18-905. The district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence, with three years determinate, for the grand theft and a unified five-year sentence, with three years determinate, for the aggravated assault charge. The sentences were ordered to run concurrently with one another and the sentences in Docket No. 46279. Engler 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, Engler's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.