

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50149

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: July 26, 2023**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 JAMES RONALD BEA, III, ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Benjamin J. Cluff, District Judge.

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

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

James Ronald Bea, III, was found guilty of felony possession of a controlled substance methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1), and misdemeanor possession of paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of seven years, with four years determinate, for possession of a controlled substance, and one year for possession of paraphernalia to run concurrently. Bea appeals, contending that his seven-year sentence, with four years determinate, 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, Bea's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.