

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 49274/49275

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: July 1, 2022**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
) **BRANDON LEE LITTLE,**)
)
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of eight years with two years determinate for burglary and ten years with two years determinate for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, affirmed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

In cases consolidated on appeal, Brandon Lee Little pled guilty to burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, I.C. § 37-2732(a). In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of eight years with two years determinate for burglary and ten years with two years determinate for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver. Little 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, Little's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.