

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 49191/49192

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: June 15, 2022**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 RYAN PAUL NEALE,) **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. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years, for trafficking heroin, concealment of evidence, and possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Emily M. Joyce, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Andrew V. Wake, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LORELLO, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

This appeal involves two consolidated cases. Ryan Paul Neal pled guilty to trafficking heroin, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(6), concealment of evidence, I.C. § 18-2603, and possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years, for trafficking heroin; an indeterminate two-year sentence for concealment of evidence; and an indeterminate three-year sentence for possession of a controlled substance. The district court ordered the sentences to run consecutively. Neale appeals, contending 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 records in these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Neale's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.