

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49063

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: June 9, 2022**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
SASHA DEE MARTINEZ,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Bruce L. Pickett, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eleven years with four years determinate for aggravated battery and consecutive sentence of five years indeterminate for possession of methamphetamine, affirmed.

Maya P. Waldron, Waldron Legal, PLLC, 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

Sasha Dee Martinez pled guilty to aggravated battery, Idaho Code § 18-907, and possession of methamphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years with five years determinate for aggravated battery and five years indeterminate for possession of methamphetamine. The district court ordered the sentences to run consecutive to each other and concurrently with Martinez's sentence in a separate case. Martinez filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of her sentences, which the district court granted in part, modifying

her aggravated battery sentence to a unified term of eleven years with four years determinate. Martinez appeals, contending 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, Martinez's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.