

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48098/48099

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	Filed: September 1, 2021
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)	
	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
ERICK BROWN,	)	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. Jonathan Medema, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and consecutive, unified sentences of ten years with five years determinate for felony injury to children and five years indeterminate for felony injury to children, 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 HUSKEY, Chief Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

In cases consolidated for appeal, Erick Brown entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea in Docket No. 48098 to felony injury to children, Idaho Code § 18-1501(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years with five years determinate and gave Brown credit for time served. In Docket No. 48099, Brown pled guilty to felony injury to children, I.C. § 18-1501, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

district court imposed five years indeterminate to run consecutive to Brown's sentence in Docket No. 48098. Brown 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). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020).

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Brown's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.