## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 47514**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
Plaintiff-Respondent,	) Filed: April 21, 2020
	) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
STEPHEN MATTHEW LOTT,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and determinate sentence of fifteen years for voluntary manslaughter and consecutive determinate term of ten years for failure to report a death, <u>affirmed</u>.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_

Before GRATTON, Judge; LORELLO, Judge; and BRAILSFORD, Judge

\_\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM

Stephen Matthew Lott entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to voluntary manslaughter, I.C. § 18-4006(1), and pled guilty to failure to notify of a death, I.C. § 19-4301A(3). The district court sentenced Lott to a determinate term of fifteen years for voluntary manslaughter and a consecutive

See North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

term of ten years for failure to notify of a death. Lott appeals, arguing 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, Lott's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.