

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49405

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: March 24, 2023**
)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Blaine County. Hon. Ned C. Williamson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified life sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of twenty-five years, for rape where the victim is under sixteen years of age and the perpetrator is over eighteen years of age, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LORELLO, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Edward Williams was found guilty of rape where the victim is under sixteen years of age and the perpetrator is over eighteen years of age. I.C. § 18-6101(1). The State subsequently dismissed the allegation that Williams is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Williams to a unified term of life imprisonment, with a minimum period of confinement of twenty-five years. Williams appeals, arguing that his 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, Williams' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.