

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48849

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: May 10, 2022**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 DARIAN SHAYNE DANIEL,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and sentence of 180 days jails, \$500 fine, and court costs for misdemeanor disturbing the peace, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason Pintler, 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

A jury found Darian Shayne Daniel guilty of misdemeanor disturbing the peace, Idaho Code § 18-6409. The district court imposed 180 days of jail with credit for time served and ordered Daniel to pay a \$500 fine and court costs. Daniel appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive because the district court imposed court costs and a \$500 fine, even though Daniel served 95 more days than the maximum 180 days authorized under the statute.

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, as the amount of court costs and fine were within the statutory limits. Therefore, Daniel's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.