

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 46809/46822

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: November 8, 2019</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>LORENZO EDWARD FARNELL,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Christopher S. Nye, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and unified sentences of twenty-five years, with ten years determinate, for lewd conduct with a child under sixteen years of age, and ten-years, with seven years determinate, for injury to a child to run concurrently, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

---

In two separate cases, Lorenzo Edward Farnell pleaded guilty to lewd conduct with a child under sixteen years of age, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and injury to a child, I.C. § 18-1501(a). Respectively, the district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty-five years, with ten years determinate, and a unified sentence of ten years, with seven years determinate, with the sentences to run concurrently.<sup>1</sup> Farnell appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive.

<sup>1</sup> The district court’s written judgment erroneously states the determinate portion of Farnell’s ten-year sentence is three years, with seven years indeterminate, for the injury to child charge, whereas the district court’s oral pronouncement was that the sentence is ten years, with

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, Farnell's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.

---

seven years determinate. Where there is a discrepancy between the oral pronouncement and the written order, the oral pronouncement controls. *State v. Watts*, 131 Idaho 782, 786, 963, P.2d 1219, 1223 (Ct. App. 1998).