

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50535

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: October 27, 2023**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ELIZABETH ROSE CROFTS, ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Cassia County. Hon. Michael P. Tribe, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, for second degree kidnapping, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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

Elizabeth Rose Crofts entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to kidnapping in the second degree, Idaho Code § 18-4501. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, and retained jurisdiction. Crofts appeals, contending that her 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

<sup>1</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

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, Crofts' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.