

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49259

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: August 26, 2022**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **ROBIN CARL CRISLER,**) **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 A. Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, heroin; cocaine; and methamphetamine, affirmed

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

Robin Carl Crisler was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance, heroin, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1); possession of a controlled substance, cocaine, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1); possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1); and possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1). Crisler pled guilty to a persistent violator enhancement charge, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of ten years with two years determinate on each of the possession of a controlled substance charges and

applied credit for time served on the paraphernalia charge. Crisler appeals, contending that his sentences for possession 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, Crisler's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.