

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46864

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: April 29, 2020</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
NATHAN ALEN POWELL,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Dane H. Watkins, Jr., District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent sentences of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance; five years with three years determinate for felony destruction, alteration, or concealment of evidence; and time served for possession of drug paraphernalia, affirmed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jeff Nye, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Nathan Alen Powell was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance (Count I); felony destruction, alteration, or concealment of evidence (Count II); and possession of drug paraphernalia (Count III). Idaho Code §§ 37-2732(c)(1), 18-2603, 37-2734A(1). The district court sentenced Powell to concurrent sentences of seven years with three years determinate for Count I, five years with three years determinate for Count II, and time served for Count III. Powell appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

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, Powell's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.