

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49004

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) |
| |) Filed: May 10, 2022 |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) |
| |) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk |
| v. |) |
| |) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| ALEJANDRO TOMAS MORALES, |) OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| |) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) |
| |) |

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Christopher S. Nye, District Judge.

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

PER CURIAM

Alejandro Tomas Morales was found guilty of grand theft by possession, Idaho Code § 18-2403(4) and Morales pled guilty to a persistent violator enhancement, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court imposed a unified term of six years with two years determinate to run concurrent with any other sentence imposed in state and/or federal court. Morales appeals, contending that his sentence is 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, Morales' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.