

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49047

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: March 16, 2022**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 ) **BRITTANY MARIE BEDOLLA,** )  
 ) **Defendant-Appellant.** )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Madison County. Hon. Steven W. Boyce, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years, for leaving the scene of an accident resulting in injury or death and concurrent, unified sentence of nine years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years, for aggravated driving under the influence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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

Brittany Marie Bedolla pled guilty to leaving the scene of an accident resulting in injury or death, I.C. § 18-8007, and aggravated driving under the influence (DUI), I.C. § 18-8006. In exchange for her guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Bedolla to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years, for leaving the scene of the accident and a concurrent, unified term of nine years, with

a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years, for aggravated DUI. Bedolla filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Bedolla appeals, arguing that her 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, Bedolla's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.