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

## **Docket No. 50020**

)
) Filed: May 8, 2023
)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Javier L. Gabiola, District Judge.

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

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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

Hailey Margaret Card pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1), and possession of paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A. In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of seven years with two years determinate for the possession of a controlled substance conviction. Card appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Card does not appeal her conviction or sentence for possession of paraphernalia.

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, Card's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.