

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48907

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: June 29, 2022**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **v.** )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **CHANCE HUNTER MASSEY,** ) **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. Lamont C. Berez, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of five years with two and one-half years determinate for felony possession of marijuana in an amount greater than three ounces and two counts of felony possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance and seven days in jail for one count of resisting and/or obstructing an officer and one count of possession of drug paraphernalia, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, 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; GRATTON, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Chance Hunter Massey was found guilty of felony possession of marijuana in an amount greater than three ounces, Idaho Code § 37-2732(e); two counts of felony possession with intent to deliver a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A); one count of resisting and/or obstructing an officer, I.C. § 18-705; and one count of possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1). The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of five years with

two and one-half years determinate for the three felony convictions, seven days in jail for the obstructing and paraphernalia charges, and placed Massey on probation. Massey appeals, contending 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).

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Massey's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.