

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46760

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) |
| |) Filed: November 13, 2019 |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) |
| |) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk |
| v. |) |
| |) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| TRAVIS CLAYTON MIFFLIN, |) OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| |) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) |
| _____ |) |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Jerome County. Hon. John K. Butler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for sexual battery of a child sixteen or seventeen years of age, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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

Travis Clayton Mifflin pleaded guilty to sexual battery of a child sixteen or seventeen years of age, Idaho Code § 18-1508A. The district court imposed a unified twenty-year sentence, with six years determinate. Mifflin appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive; specifically Mifflin challenges the indeterminate portion of his sentence and the fact that the court ordered his sentence to run consecutively to another sentence.

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, Mifflin's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.