

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 47658/47659

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: October 14, 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) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**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. Deborah A. Bail; Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judges.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twenty years with five years determinate for trafficking in heroin; twenty years with five years determinate for trafficking in methamphetamine or amphetamine; and one year determinate for possession, introduction or removal of certain articles into or from correctional facilities, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

In consolidated cases, Shannon Elaine Smith pled guilty to trafficking in heroin, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(6)(A); trafficking in methamphetamine or amphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(4)(A); and possession, introduction or removal of certain articles into or from correctional facilities, I.C. §§ 18-2510(3), 19-2520F. In Docket No. 47658, the district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty years with five years determinate for trafficking in heroin. In Docket No. 47659, the district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty years with five

years determinate for trafficking in methamphetamine or amphetamine and one year determinate for introduction of contraband. These sentences were ordered to run concurrently with each other and concurrently with the sentence in Docket No. 47658. Smith appeals, contending that her 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 courts abused their discretion. Therefore, Smith's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.