

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47390

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: June 17, 2020</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
ANTHONY AARON FRANCES,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Gene A. Petty, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years with a one-year determinate term for felony malicious injury to property, 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

Anthony Aaron Frances pled guilty to felony malicious injury to property, Idaho Code § 18-7001(2), and misdemeanor domestic assault, I.C. § 18-918(3)(a). The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years with a one-year determinate term for the felony and a concurrent sentence of thirteen days in jail with credit for thirteen days served for the misdemeanor. Frances appeals, contending that his sentence for malicious injury to property is 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, Frances's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.