

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48642

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: October 27, 2021
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
TOMMY DEAN NASH,)	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. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate sentence of fifteen years, with five years determinate, for two counts of burglary and two counts of grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Emily M. Joyce, 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

Tommy Dean Nash pleaded guilty to two counts of burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and two counts of grand theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), -2407(1)(b), -2409. On one count of burglary, the district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence, with three years determinate. On the second count of burglary, the district court imposed a five-year indeterminate sentence to run consecutively to the first count. On each count of grand theft, the district court imposed a fourteen-year indeterminate sentence to run concurrently to all other counts. Nash 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, 157 (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, Nash's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.