

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48866

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: January 14, 2022**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
) **v.**) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **RUBIN TOLEDO,**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Robert C. Naftz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified concurrent sentences of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for two counts of criminal possession of a financial transaction card affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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

Rubin Toledo pled guilty to two counts of criminal possession of a financial transaction card. I.C. § 18-3125. In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court withheld judgment and placed Toledo on probation for three years.

Subsequently, Toledo admitted to violating the terms of the probation, and the district court consequently revoked the withheld judgment and probation and sentenced Toledo to concurrent unified terms of four years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years. On appeal, Toledo

does not challenge the district court's decision to revoke probation, but argues only 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).

Therefore, Toledo's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.