

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48471/48472/48477

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: October 25, 2021**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 WILLIAM RICHARD SHELTON, IV,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Christopher S. Nye, District Judge.

Docket Nos. 48471 and 48477, judgments of conviction and aggregate sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for three charges of grand theft, affirmed; and Docket No. 48472, appeal dismissed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

This appeal involves three cases. In each case, William Richard Shelton pleaded guilty to a single charge of grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403. In Docket No. 48471 and Docket No. 48472, the district court imposed a unified sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for each charge. In Docket No. 48477, the district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for the grand theft charge. The district court ordered the sentences to run concurrently. Sometime later, and pursuant to a petition for post-conviction relief, the district court re-entered the judgments of conviction in each case so

that Shelton could appeal from the judgments of conviction. Shelton 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).

In Docket Number 48472, Shelton submitted a guilty plea advisory form, wherein he waived his right to appeal his sentence as part of the plea agreement in the case. Because the only issue raised in that case is one challenging his sentence, we dismiss the appeal in Docket No. 48472.

Applying the above standards in Docket Nos. 48471 and 48477, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Shelton's judgments of conviction and sentences in those cases are affirmed.