## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 49866**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: March 1, 2023
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
DRAGOS UNGUREAN,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for conspiracy to deliver/manufacture a controlled substance and five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for unlawful possession of a firearm, 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 BRAILSFORD, Judge

## PER CURIAM

Dragos Ungurean pled guilty to conspiracy deliver/manufacture a controlled substance, I.C. §§ 37-2732(a), 18-1701, and 37-2732(f); and unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. §§ 18-3316 and 18-204. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Ungurean to concurrent, unified terms of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for conspiracy to deliver/manufacture a controlled substance and five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for unlawful possession of a firearm. Ungurean appeals, arguing 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, Ungurean's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.