

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50230

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: August 18, 2023**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 CHANDRA ALYSSA ORTIZ,) **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. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of five years, for trafficking in methamphetamine, and a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of one year, for unlawful possession of a firearm, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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

Chandra Alyssa Ortiz pled guilty to trafficking in methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(a)(4)(A), and unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of five years, for trafficking in methamphetamine, and a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of one year, for unlawful possession of a firearm, with the sentences to run concurrently. Ortiz appeals, contending that her 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, Ortiz's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.