IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 47235/47258

)
) Filed: December 24, 2020
)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
)

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

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, and judgment of conviction and determinate sentence of five years for exploitation of a child, <u>affirmed</u>.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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; GRATTON, Judge; and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these two consolidated cases, Eric Michael Rollins pleaded guilty to one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and one count of sexual exploitation of a child, I.C. § 18-1507(2)(c). The district court imposed a twenty-year sentence, with five years determinate, for the lewd conduct with a minor conviction and a determinate five-year sentence for the sexual exploitation conviction. The sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Rollins 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, Rollins' judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.