

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48745

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: December 14, 2021**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 JACOB TAYLOR RAINIER,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and sentences for reckless driving and possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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

Jacob Taylor Rainier pleaded guilty to misdemeanor reckless driving, Idaho Code § 49-1401 and misdemeanor possession of a controlled substance, marijuana, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(3). The district court imposed a 180-day sentence for the reckless driving, with 123 days suspended, and a 365-day sentence, with 298 days suspended, for possession of a marijuana. The district court placed Rainier on probation for two years and ordered the sentences to run consecutively. Rainier 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, Rainier's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.