

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49911

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: January 10, 2023
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 TIMOTHY ALAN PEARSON, JR.,) 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. Steven J. Hippler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and consecutive sentences of twenty-five years determinate and twenty-five years indeterminate, resulting in an aggregate sentence of fifty years with twenty-five years determinate for two counts of sexual abuse of a child under sixteen years, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Timothy Alan Pearson, Jr. pled guilty to two counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, Idaho Code § 18-1506. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed consecutive sentences of twenty-five years determinate and twenty-five years indeterminate, resulting in an aggregate sentence of fifty years with twenty-five years determinate. Pearson appeals, contending that his 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, Pearson's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.