

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50529

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: February 13, 2024**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 JAMES RODNEY SHAFF,) **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. Roger B. Harris, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified concurrent life sentences, with a minimum period of incarceration of fifteen years, for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen and sexual battery of a minor child sixteen or seventeen years of age, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

James Rodney Shaff was found guilty of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, sexual battery of a minor child sixteen or seventeen years of age, I.C. § 18-1508A(1)(a), and misdemeanor dispensing to a minor, I.C. § 23-603. For each felony, the district court imposed a concurrent, unified life sentence, with a minimum period of incarceration of fifteen years. For the misdemeanor, the district court imposed thirty days of jail. The sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Shaff 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, Shaff's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.