

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48617

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: February 4, 2022**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 PHILLIP RONALD BAKER,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Blaine County. Hon. Ned C. Williamson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Phillip Ronald Baker pleaded guilty to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years, suspended the sentence and placed Baker on probation for a term of three years. Baker appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive, including that the district court abused its discretion by imposing a sentence with a period of 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). 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, Baker's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.