

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50571

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: October 17, 2023**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **v.** )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 )  
 ) **CHANTEL RAYLENE TUCKER,** )  
 )  
 ) **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 five years with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years for possession of major contraband in a correctional facility, 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

Chantel Raylene Tucker entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to possession of major contraband in a correctional facility, Idaho Code § 18-2510(3)(c). The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years with two and one-half years determinate. Tucker appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive.

---

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

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, Tucker's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.