

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48871

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: January 14, 2022
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
ELIZABETH BRITIANY KEYES,) 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. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years with ten years determinate for second degree murder and concurrent, five-year, determinate term for alteration or concealment of evidence, affirmed.

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

Elizabeth Britiany Keyes entered an *Alford*¹ plea to second degree murder, Idaho Code §§ 18-4001, 18-4003(g), and alteration or concealment of evidence, I.C. § 18-2603. The district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty-five years with ten years determinate for second degree murder and a concurrent, five-year, determine term for alteration or concealment of evidence. Keyes appeals, contending that her sentences are excessive.

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

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, Keyes's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.