

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50116

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 JOHN DAVID KEENA,)
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Brent L. Whiting, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of thirty-two years, with a minimum period of confinement of seventeen years, for trafficking in heroin, possession of a controlled substance, possession of drug paraphernalia, and being a persistent violator, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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 HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

John David Keena was found guilty of trafficking in heroin, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(6); possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1); possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1); and admitted to being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Keena to a unified term of thirty-two years, with a minimum period of confinement of seventeen years, for trafficking in heroin and being a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Keena to a concurrent, unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of

confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance, and a concurrent determinate term of 366 days for possession of drug paraphernalia. The district court also ordered that Keena's sentences be served concurrently with other unrelated sentences. Keena appeals, arguing 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, Keena's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.