

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49731

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: January 18, 2023**
)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified life sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for voluntary manslaughter and being a persistent violator, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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

Andrew Ray Garcia pled guilty to an amended charge of voluntary manslaughter, I.C. § 18-4006(1), and admitted to being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2415. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. According to the terms of the plea agreement, the parties agreed that Garcia would be sentenced to a determinate term of fifteen years and that he could submit argument relative to any indeterminate term the district court would impose. The district court sentenced Garcia to a unified life term, with the agreed-upon minimum period of

confinement of fifteen years. Garcia appeals, arguing that the indeterminate portion of his life imprisonment 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, Garcia's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.