

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47202

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: May 27, 2020**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **JOE ANTHONY SANTIAGO,**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Darla S. Williamson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years, for two counts of possession of a controlled substance and being a persistent violator, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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

Joe Anthony Santiago was found guilty of two counts of possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c), and being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court

sentenced Santiago to concurrent unified terms of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years. Santiago appeals, arguing that his sentences are excessive.¹

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

¹ Santiago was also found guilty of possession of drug paraphernalia and sentenced to a concurrent term of 180 days. However, he does not challenge this judgment of conviction or sentence on appeal.