

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47301

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: July 16, 2020**
)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Rosemary Emory, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and consecutive, unified sentences of five years determinate, five years determinate, two years determinate, one year determinate, and one year determinate for each of five counts of no-contact order violation, affirmed.

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

Kevin Keith Bell pled guilty to five counts of no-contact order violation, Idaho Code § 18-920(3). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed two determinate five-year sentences, a two-year determinate sentence, and two one-year determinate sentences. The sentences were ordered to run consecutive to each other and concurrently with Bell’s sentences in a prior case. Bell appeals, contending 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 the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Bell's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.