

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46834

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: January 17, 2020**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
LEO MICHAEL INWOOD,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for unlawful concealment of evidence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Andrew V. Wake, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Leo Michael Inwood was found guilty of unlawful concealment of evidence. I.C. § 18-2603. The district court sentenced Inwood to a unified term of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years. However, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Inwood on probation. Mindful that Inwood received probation as he requested, he appeals, arguing that his underlying suspended sentence is 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, Inwood's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.