



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).

The district court determined that a withheld judgment was not appropriate in this case. The district court wanted Briggs to "have some incentive that if you do violate probation, which I'm going to give you a chance at, that you can expect no less than a rider." The district court also explained to Briggs that if he successfully completed probation, he could file a motion to remove the felony from his record. The court noted that Briggs' time in custody "was because of [his] choices" and the court "tried to release [Briggs] but it didn't work." The district court's finding is supported by the record. The district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to enter a withheld judgment. Therefore, Briggs' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.