

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49215

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) Filed: August 9, 2022  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 ) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk  
 v. )  
 ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
 MATTHEW JAMES STAVERT, ) 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 consecutive, unified sentences of ten years with five years determinate for involuntary manslaughter and twenty-three years with three years determinate for robbery, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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

Matthew James Stavert pled guilty to involuntary manslaughter, Idaho Code § 18-4006(2), and robbery, I.C. § 18-6501. The district court imposed consecutive, unified sentences of ten years with five years determinate for involuntary manslaughter and twenty-three years with three years determinate for robbery. Stavert filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of his sentences, which the district court denied. Stavert 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 record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Stavert's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.