

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49454

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: December 23, 2022**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 BESSIE MARIE PETERSON,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Boise County. Hon. Ronald J. Wilper, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate, unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for ten counts of possession of sexually exploitative material, affirmed.

Maya P. Waldron, 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 BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Bessie Marie Peterson was found guilty of ten counts of possession of sexually exploitative material. I.C. § 18-1507(2)(a). The district court sentenced Peterson to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for one count and concurrent, indeterminate terms of five years for the remaining nine counts. The district court ordered that the first count and the remaining concurrent nine counts be served consecutively--making an aggregate unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years. Peterson appeals, arguing that her aggregate 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, Peterson's judgment of conviction and aggregate sentence are affirmed.