

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50201

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: November 13, 2023
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
DAVID JOHN ESHESHI,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years with a minimum period of confinement of four years for enticement of a child through use of the internet or other communication device, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; John C. McKinney, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

David John Esheshi¹ pled guilty to enticement of a child through use of the internet or other communication device, Idaho Code § 18-1509A. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years with four years determinate. Esheshi appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive.

¹ Also known as: David Esheshi John, Esheshi David John, John Esheshi David, Jed Esheshi John

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