

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49872

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: February 9, 2023
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 URIAH Z. RUNDELL,) 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. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years with eight years determinate for trafficking in heroin, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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

Uriah Z. Rundell pled guilty to trafficking in heroin, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(6)(A), and misdemeanor operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of drugs, I.C. § 18-8004. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of twenty years with eight years determinate for trafficking and a concurrent sentence of six months in jail with credit for six months served for the misdemeanor. Rundell appeals, contending that his trafficking 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, Rundell's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.