

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49830

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: September 6, 2023
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 JOHN DAVID KEENA,) 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. Lynn G. Norton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of thirty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for trafficking in heroin, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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 HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

John David Keena was found guilty of trafficking in heroin. I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(6). The district court sentenced Keena to a unified term of thirty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years. Keena appeals, arguing that the indeterminate portion of his sentence is excessive.¹

¹ Keena was also found guilty of two counts of possession of a controlled substance and possession of drug paraphernalia. He was sentenced to determinate terms of seven years for the two counts of possession of a controlled substance and 365 days in jail for possession of drug

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, Keena's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

paraphernalia. The district court ordered that all of Keena's sentences be served concurrently. However, in his appellate brief, Keena only requests that the indeterminate portion of his sentence be reduced, thereby not challenging these sentences.