

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49304

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: September 15, 2022**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
DANNY RAY STODDARD,) **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. Steven J. Hippler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of thirty years with a minimum period of confinement of twelve years for lewd conduct with a minor child under sixteen; and twenty-five years with ten years determinate for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, 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

Danny Ray Stoddard was found guilty of one count of lewd conduct with a minor child under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508; and one count of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, I.C. § 18-1506. The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of thirty years with twelve years determinate for lewd conduct and twenty-five years with ten years determinate for sexual abuse of a child. Stoddard 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, Stoddard's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.