

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50587

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: February 15, 2024**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 KRISTIN ANN CHADWICK ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 MARTINEZ, ) **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. Roger S. Burdick, Senior District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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

Kristin Ann Chadwick Martinez was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c) and possession of drug paraphernalia, I.C. §37-2734A. Chadwick admitted to a persistent violator enhancement. The district court imposed a unified term of eight years with three years determinate for possession of a controlled substance, time served for possession of drug paraphernalia, and retained jurisdiction. Chadwick 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 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, Chadwick's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.