

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49272

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: July 6, 2022</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
BRIAN ALEXANDER LYMAN,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for battery with the intent to commit a serious felony (rape), affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, 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

Brian Alexander Lyman entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to an amended charge of battery with the intent to commit a serious felony (rape). I.C. §§ 18-903 and 18-901. The district court sentenced Lyman to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Lyman appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

<sup>1</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

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