

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48800/48801/48802/48803

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: February 25, 2022**
)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent unified sentences in the aggregate of fourteen years with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for the crimes of two counts of grand theft, burglary, and forgery, 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 GRATTON, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated appeals, William Storm Buell pled guilty to committing four crimes: two counts of grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), 18-2409; burglary, I.C. § 18-1401; and forgery, I.C. § 18-3601. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences in the aggregate of fourteen years with five years determinate. Buell appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive. Buell asks this Court to vacate his sentences and remand his case to the district court for resentencing.

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 these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Buell's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.