

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 50021/50022

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 LEROY ANTHONY OTERO, )  
 )  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 )

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and unified concurrent sentences of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for burglary and possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Mark O. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before LORELLO, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;  
and HUSKEY, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

In Docket No. 50021, Leroy Anthony Otero was found guilty of burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401. In Docket No. 50022, Otero pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). At a joint sentencing hearing, the district court imposed concurrent sentences of six years with three years determinate for each case. Otero appeals, contending 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, Otero's judgments of conviction and concurrent sentences are affirmed.