

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 50243/50244/50245

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: December 28, 2023
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
SHAWN REX HASKELL,)	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.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of incarceration of seven years, for three counts of felony driving under the influence of alcohol, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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

Pursuant to a plea agreement in three consolidated cases, Shawn Rex Haskell pled guilty to one count of driving under the influence of alcohol (previously found guilty of a prior felony within fifteen years), Idaho Code § 18-8005(9), in each case. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed an aggregate unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of incarceration of seven years. Haskell 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 records in these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Haskell's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.