

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48393/48394

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: November 24, 2021**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 RAWDY ALAN BAUER, ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Bruce L. Pickett, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for grand theft by possession of stolen property and burglary, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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

Rawdy Alan Bauer has two cases in this consolidated appeal. In Docket No. 48393, Bauer pleaded guilty to grand theft by possession of stolen property, Idaho Code § 18-2403(4), and the district court imposed a unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years. In Docket No. 48394, Bauer pleaded guilty to burglary, I.C. § 18-1401, and the district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, to run concurrent with the grand theft sentence. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. Pursuant to an order granting post-conviction relief, the district court re-entered the judgments of conviction to allow Bauer to timely appeal. Bauer appeals,

contending that his sentences are excessive as the district court should have imposed lesser indeterminate 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). 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, Bauer's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.