

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48787

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO,        | )                                 |
|                        | ) <b>Filed: January 14, 2022</b>  |
| Plaintiff-Respondent,  | )                                 |
|                        | ) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b> |
| v.                     | )                                 |
|                        | ) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>   |
| MATTHEW SHANE STEPHAN, | ) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>    |
|                        | ) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>    |
| Defendant-Appellant.   | )                                 |
| _____                  | )                                 |

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Lansing L. Haynes, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, 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

Matthew Shane Stephan pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-27329(c)(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Stephan to a unified term of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years. The district court retained jurisdiction and sent Stephan to participate in the rider program. Stephan appeals, arguing that his sentence is 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, Stephan's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.