

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

**Docket No. 49253**

<b>STATE OF IDAHO,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Filed: September 9, 2022</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>CODY ALLEN HENDRICKS,</b>	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Jerome County. Hon. Rosemary Emory, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, and retained jurisdiction for issuing a check without funds, 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**

Cody Allen Hendricks pled guilty to issuing a check without funds, Idaho Code § 18-3106(a). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court imposed a unified three-year sentence, with one year determinate, and retained jurisdiction. Hendricks filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence. Pursuant to the Rule 35 motion, the district court suspended Hendricks' sentence and placed him on probation. Hendricks appeals, contending that his underlying sentence is 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, Hendricks's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.