

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49780

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: January 10, 2023</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
KARLEE D. MORELAND,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Second Judicial District, State of Idaho, Nez Perce County. Hon. Mark T. Monson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of four years with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years with retained jurisdiction, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Emily M. Joyce, 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

Karlee D. Moreland<sup>1</sup> entered an *Alford*<sup>2</sup> plea to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for her guilty plea, several other charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified term of four years with one and one-half years

<sup>1</sup> Karlee D. Moreland is also known as Karlee D. Torrez.

<sup>2</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

determinate and retained jurisdiction. Moreland appeals, contending that her 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, Moreland's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.