

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50718

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: January 29, 2024**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 PORSHIA PATRICIA ANN HARTMAN,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of eighteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years, for delivery of a controlled substance and possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, 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

Porshia Patricia Ann Hartman pled guilty to delivery of a controlled substance, fentanyl, Idaho Code § 37-2732(a)(1)(A), and possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). In exchange for her guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. For each charge, the district court imposed a unified sentence of eighteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of three years, and ordered the sentences to run concurrently. Hartman appeals, contending that her 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, Hartman's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.