

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49536

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: January 31, 2023</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
SONGA KATANGA,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Darla Williamson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twenty-eight years with three years determinate for lewd conduct with a child under sixteen and twenty-three years with three years determinate for sexual abuse of a minor under sixteen, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, 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 BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Songa Katanga was found guilty of lewd conduct with a child under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and sexual abuse of a minor under sixteen, I.C. § 18-1506. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of thirty years with five years determinate for lewd conduct and twenty-five years with five years determinate for sexual abuse of a minor and retained jurisdiction. The district court subsequently relinquished jurisdiction, reducing Katanga’s lewd conduct sentence to twenty-eight years with three years determinate and his sexual abuse of a minor

sentence to twenty-three years with three years determinate. Katanga 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, Katanga's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.