

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50618

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: January 16, 2024**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 NICHOLAS ROBERT BOOTS, ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Shoshone County. Hon. Barbara Duggan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for sexual battery of a minor sixteen or seventeen years of age, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, Interim State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, 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

Nicholas Robert Boots entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to sexual battery of a minor sixteen or seventeen years of age. I.C. § 18-1508A(1)(b). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Boots to a unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years. Boots appeals, arguing that his 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, Boots's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.