

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50307

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: July 27, 2023**
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 MARVIN JOEL LEMUS,) **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. Derrick J. O’Neill, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years, for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Justin R. Porter, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Marvin Joel Lemus pled guilty to lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen. I.C. § 18-1508. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Lemus to a unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years. Lemus appeals, arguing that his sentence 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, Lemus's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.