

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47170

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) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**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

Appeal from the District Court of the Second Judicial District, State of Idaho, Clearwater County. Hon. Gregory FitzMaurice, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended unified sentence of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Kari D. Martin pled guilty to an amended charge of possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court sentenced Martin to a unified term of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years.¹ However, the district court

¹ The district court's oral pronouncement indicates that Martin's sentence was a unified term of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years. Martin's judgment of conviction states that her sentence is for a determinate term of eighteen months,

suspended the sentence and placed Martin on probation. Although Martin received probation, she appeals, arguing that her 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, Martin's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

followed by an indeterminate term of three years. However, it is the oral pronouncement of sentence that is controlling. *See State v. Allen*, 144 Idaho 875, 877-78, 172 P.3d 1150, 1152-53 (Ct. App. 2007). Therefore, we view Martin's sentence as a unified term of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years.