IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49674

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: December 5, 2022
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
HONORATO CARDONA,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Power County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twenty years, with minimum periods of confinement of ten years, for trafficking in methamphetamine and possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, <u>affirmed</u>.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, 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

Honorato Cardona was found guilty of trafficking in methamphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(4)(A), and possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). The district court sentenced Cardona to concurrent, unified terms of twenty years, with minimum periods of confinement of ten years. Cardona appeals, arguing 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, Cardona's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.