

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46902

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: April 8, 2020</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>DARRELL ALLAN De MOTTE,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Jonathan Medema, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of thirty years with seven years determinate for attempted abuse, exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult; two years determinate for burglary; and thirty years with two years determinate for abuse, exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Darrell Allan De Motte was found guilty of attempted abuse, exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult (Idaho Code §§ 18-1505(1), 18-306); burglary (I.C. § 18-1401); and abuse, exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult (I.C. § 18-1505(1)); with a persistent violator enhancement (I.C. § 19-2514). The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of thirty years with seven years determinate for attempted abuse, exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult; two years determinate for burglary; and thirty years with two years determinate for abuse,

exploitation, or neglect of a vulnerable adult. De Motte 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, De Motte's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.