

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48724

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	<b>Filed: November 22, 2021</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)	
	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>KEVIN HALLIS KELLY,</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. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of twenty-four years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for one count of burglary and two counts of grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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; GRATTON, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Kevin Hallis Kelly pleaded guilty to burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and two counts of grand theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), 2407(1)(b), -2409, -204. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a ten-year determinate sentence for the burglary. For each grand theft, the district court imposed indeterminate fourteen-year sentences to run concurrently with each other and consecutively to the burglary sentence. Kelly 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, Kelly's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.