

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47903

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: December 18, 2020**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 DAKOTA ADAM GRIFFITHS,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Franklin County. Hon. Mitchell W. Brown, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for two counts of sexual exploitation of a child, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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

Dakota Adams Griffiths pled guilty to two counts of sexual exploitation of a child. Idaho Code § 18-1507(2)(a). The district court sentenced Griffiths to concurrent sentences of ten years with four years determinate and retained jurisdiction. Following the period of retained jurisdiction, the district court relinquished jurisdiction. Griffiths appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

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, Griffiths' judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.