

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49142

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) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**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

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Derrick O’Neill, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for grand theft, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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

Joshua Ross Wilkinson pled guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), -2407(1)(b), -2409. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years. Wilkinson appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive.¹

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

¹ Wilkinson also filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which was denied. Wilkinson does not challenge the denial of his I.C.R. 35 motion on appeal.

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