

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48774 & 48775

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: April 4, 2022**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 SCHREIBER, ) **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. Cynthia K.C. Meyer, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for aggravated assault with use of a deadly weapon; judgment of conviction and determinate term of ten years and concurrent determinate term of ten years for two counts of felony injury to a child, 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 LORELLO, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

In Docket No. 48774, Christopher Michael Schreiber pled guilty to aggravated assault, I.C. §§ 18-901 and 18-905, enhanced for use of a deadly weapon, I.C. § 19-2520. In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court sentenced Schreiber to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years.

In Docket No. 48775, Schreiber also pled guilty to two amended charges of felony injury to a child. I.C. § 18-1501(1). The district court sentenced Schreiber to a determinate term of ten years for one count of felony injury to a child and to a concurrent indeterminate term of ten years for the second count. The district court ordered that the sentences be served consecutive to his sentence for aggravated assault. Schreiber appeals, arguing 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, Schreiber's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.