

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48998

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: December 27, 2021**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 TASHEENA ELAINE RUSSOM,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **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. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for grand theft, 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 HUSKEY, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Tasheena Elaine Russom pled guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1). In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years. Russom appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive as the district court should have imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years.

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, Russom's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.