

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48074

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: June 15, 2021**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 STEVEN LOUIS ROACH, ) **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. Steven J. Hippler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years with ten years determinate for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen and consecutive five-year indeterminate sentence for felony stalking, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kale D. Gans, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before HUSKEY, Chief Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Steven Louis Roach pled guilty to one count of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1506(1)(d), and one count of felony stalking, I.C. § 18-7905. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty-five years with ten years determinate for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen and a consecutive five-year indeterminate sentence for felony stalking. Roach appeals, contending 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, Roach's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.