

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49007

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) Filed: August 31, 2022  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 ) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk  
 v. )  
 ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
 FORREST J. PILANT, ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT  
 ) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Second Judicial District, State of Idaho, Idaho County. Hon. Gregory FitzMaurice, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for felony injury to a child and concurrent, unified sentence of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for aggravated battery, 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; GRATTON, Judge;  
and HUSKEY, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Forrest J. Pilant was found guilty of felony injury to a child, I.C. § 18-1501(1), and aggravated battery, I.C. § 18-907(1)(a). The district court sentenced Pilant to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for felony injury to a child and a concurrent, unified term of twelve years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for aggravated battery. Pilant filed an I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of his sentences, which the district court denied. Pilant appeals, arguing 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, Pilant's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.