



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).

After a defendant has been convicted of a crime, a district court may, in its discretion, withhold judgment. I.C. § 19-2601(3); *State v. Trejo*, 132 Idaho 872, 880, 979 P.2d 1230, 1238 (Ct. App. 1999). Refusal to grant a withheld judgment will not be deemed an abuse of discretion if the trial court has sufficient information to determine that a withheld judgment would be inappropriate. *State v. Edghill*, 134 Idaho 218, 219, 999 P.2d 255, 256 (Ct. App. 2000); *State v. Geier*, 109 Idaho 963, 965, 712 P.2d 664, 666 (Ct. App. 1985).

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Allen's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.