

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48565/48573

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: October 8, 2021</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
CARMELO VILLANUEVA GALARZA,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Minidoka County. Hon. Jonathan P. Brody, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of ten years with seven years determinate for felony injury to a child and twenty-five years with seven years determinate for second degree kidnapping, 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

In cases consolidated for appeal, Carmelo Villanueva Galarza pled guilty to felony injury to a child, Idaho Code § 18-1501(1), and second degree kidnapping, I.C. §§ 18-4501, 18-4503. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of ten years with seven years determinate for felony injury to a child and twenty-five years with seven years determinate for second degree kidnapping. Villanueva Galarza filed Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motions for reduction of his sentences, which were denied. Villanueva Galarza 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, Villanueva Galarza's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.