

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49834

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: February 13, 2024**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 MONICA MAE LACY, ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  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. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate, unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, for grand theft, burglary, and grand theft by possession of stolen property, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge  
and LORELLO, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Monica Mae Lacy was found guilty of grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1), grand theft by possession of stolen property, I.C. § 18-2403(4), and burglary, I.C. § 18-1401. For each grand theft charge, the district court imposed a unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, and for the burglary charge, the district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years. The sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Lacy appeals, contending that her 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, Lacy's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.