IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48219

STATE OF IDAHO,)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: March 11, 2022
)) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JAMES D. HILL,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Madison County. Hon. Steven W. Boyce, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of thirteen and one-half years with six and one-half years determinate for felony injury to a child and ten years with six and one-half years determinate for aggravated battery, <u>affirmed</u>.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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; HUSKEY, Judge; and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

James D. Hill entered an *Alford*¹ plea to felony injury to a child, Idaho Code § 18-1501(1), and aggravated battery, I.C. § 18-907. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of thirteen and one-half years with six and one-half years determinate and ten years with six and one-half years determinate, respectively. Hill appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive.

1

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

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, Hill's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.