

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49530

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: December 9, 2022</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>PATRICK MICHAEL WHITE,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for trafficking heroin; concurrent indeterminate term of five years for introduction of certain articles into a correctional facility, affirmed

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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

Patrick Michael White was found guilty of trafficking heroin, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(6)(C) and introduction of certain articles into a correctional facility, I.C. §§ 18-2510(3), 19-2520F. The district court imposed a unified term of twenty-five years with fifteen years determinate for trafficking heroin and a concurrent indeterminate term of five years for introduction of certain articles into a correctional facility. White appeals, contending that his sentence for trafficking 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, White's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.