

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 46776/46777

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: August 16, 2019
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JAVIER C. CARRILLO, SR.,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Thomas W. Whitney, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and unified sentences of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, to run consecutively, for two counts of violation of a no contact order, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, 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 BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Javier C. Carrillo, Sr. pleaded guilty to felony violation of a no contact order, third offense, Idaho Code § 18-920(3), and in a separate case, Carrillo pleaded guilty to felony violation of a no contact order, third offense, I.C. 18-920(3), malicious injury to property, I.C. 18-7001, and unlawful entry, I.C. 18-7034(1). The district court imposed unified sentences of five years, with one year determinate, to be served consecutively, for the two no contact order violations and credit for time served for the malicious injury to property and unlawful entry. Carrillo 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, Carrillo's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.