

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48407

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: June 1, 2021**  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ANTHONY HENRY PRICHARD, ) **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. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for felony domestic violence, 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 GRATTON, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Anthony Henry Prichard pled guilty to felony domestic violence. I.C. §§ 18-903(a) and 18-918(2). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed and the State agreed not to pursue a persistent violator enhancement. The district court sentenced Prichard to a unified

term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years.<sup>1</sup> Prichard appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive and that the district court should have placed him on probation.

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).

The decision to place a defendant on probation is also a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The goal of probation is to foster the probationer's rehabilitation while protecting society. *State v. Gawron*, 112 Idaho 841, 843, 736 P.2d 1295, 1297 (1987); *State v. Cheatham*, 159 Idaho 856, 858, 367 P.3d 251, 253 (Ct. App. 2016).

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Prichard was originally sentenced to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Following post-conviction relief and consideration of a mental health evaluation, the district court resentenced Prichard to ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years.