

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 47232/47254/47255

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: March 16, 2020**
)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Joel E. Tingey, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent sentences of: unified term fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for robbery; unified term of six years with a minimum period of confinement of two years for burglary; unified term of fourteen years with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for robbery, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; R. Jonathan Shirts, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Denise Lynne Williams pled guilty to two counts of robbery and one count of burglary in these consolidated cases. Idaho Code §§ 18-6501, 18-1401. The district court sentenced Williams to concurrent sentences as follows: a unified term of fourteen years with four years determinate on one robbery charge (Docket No. 47232); a unified term of six years with two years determinate on the burglary charge (Docket No. 47254); and fourteen years with five years

determinate on the second robbery charge. Williams appeals arguing 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, Williams' judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.