

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48844

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: March 1, 2022**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **CODY DON CAMPBELL,** ) **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. Rich Christensen, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eighteen years with eight years determinate for robbery, 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 LORELLO, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Cody Don Campbell pled guilty to robbery, Idaho Code § 18-6501, with an enhancement for infliction of great bodily injury, I.C. § 19-2502B. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty years with eight years determinate. After Campbell filed a petition for post-conviction relief, the parties agreed to a mental health evaluation and an updated presentence investigation report, which the district court ordered. At the resentencing hearing, the district court reduced Campbell’s indeterminate term by two years, imposing a unified sentence of eighteen years with eight years determinate. Campbell appeals, contending 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, Campbell's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.