

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48696

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	<b>Filed: January 12, 2022</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)	
	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>ROBYN DEANNE SCHOONOVER,</b>	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. James S. Cawthon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for trafficking in methamphetamine and or amphetamine, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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; GRATTON, Judge;  
and HUSKEY, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Robyn Deanne Schoonover pleaded guilty to trafficking in methamphetamine and or amphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(4)(A). The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Schoonover appeals, contending that the indeterminate portion of her sentence is excessive. Schoonover does not challenge the determinate portion of her sentence because the mandatory minimum sentence for the charge is three years pursuant to I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(4)(A).

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, Schoonover's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.