

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49758

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: March 20, 2023**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 DEREK MUNRO VANIMAN,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Derrick J. O’Neill, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and consecutive, unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years for one count of sexual exploitation of a child and five years indeterminate for one count of sexual exploitation of a child, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Derek Munro Vaniman pled guilty to two counts of sexual exploitation of a child, Idaho Code § 18-1507(2)(a). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified term of ten years with four years determinate for the first count and five years indeterminate for the second count, to run consecutively. Vaniman 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, Vaniman's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.