

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50213

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: August 21, 2023**  
 )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Steven J. Hippler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four and one-half years, for one count of grand theft and an indeterminate term of ten years for one count of grand theft, 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

Ismael Alizandro Aceves pled guilty to two counts of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), 18-2409. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified term of fourteen years with four and one-half years determinate for Count I and a term of ten years indeterminate for Count II. The district court also ordered the sentences to be served consecutively to each other as well as consecutively to the sentences in an unrelated case. Aceves 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, Aceves's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.