

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50466

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: March 4, 2024**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 KATHARINE E. VANBLARICOM, ) **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. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, for felony possession of a controlled substance, morphine, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kale D. Gans, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Katharine E. Vanblaricom was found guilty of felony possession of a controlled substance, morphine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1); misdemeanor possession of a controlled substance, marijuana, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(3); and misdemeanor possession of drug paraphernalia with intent to use, I.C. § 37-2734(A)(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, suspended the sentence, and placed Vanblaricom on a term of probation. The district court imposed thirty days of jail for each misdemeanor.

Vanblaricom appeals, contending that her underlying sentence for possession of morphine 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, Vanblaricom's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.