

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49132

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: May 25, 2022**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 JENNIFER LAURA CARTER,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Lansing L. Haynes, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified four year sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of forged documents, 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 LORELLO, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Jennifer Laura Carter pled guilty to felony possession of forged documents, Idaho Code § 18-3605, and misdemeanor possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1). For the felony, the district court imposed a unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, and retained jurisdiction. For the misdemeanor, the district court imposed a sentence of forty-six days jail with credit for time served. Carter appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive because the court should have placed her on probation rather than retaining jurisdiction.

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