

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47339

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: April 28, 2020
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 SARA L. JONES,) 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. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, concurrent unified sentences of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years, for burglary and grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, 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

Sara J. Jones was found guilty of burglary, (I.C. § 18-1401) and grand theft (I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), and 18-2409). The district court sentenced Jones to concurrent unified terms of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years. The district court retained jurisdiction and sent Jones to participate in the rider program. Following successful completion of her rider, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Jones on probation for five years. Jones appeals, arguing that her underlying 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, Jones's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.