

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49995

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: March 29, 2023**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 ROYCE E. SATTERLUND,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Boundary County. Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Royce E. Satterlund pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge and a sentence enhancement for being a repeat drug offender were dismissed. Pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, the State recommended that the district court sentence Satterlund to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, and retain jurisdiction. During the sentencing hearing, Satterlund requested that the district court retain jurisdiction. The district court sentenced

Satterlund to a unified term of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, and retained jurisdiction. Satterlund appeals, arguing 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, Satterlund's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.