

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50800

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: February 20, 2024**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **GERALD RYAN CORRON,**)
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Robert C. Naftz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of four years, with minimum periods of confinement of one year, for possession of a controlled substance and possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

Gerald Ryan Corron pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1), and possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1)(B). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge and an allegation that he is a persistent violator were dismissed. The district court sentenced Corron to concurrent, unified terms of four years, with minimum periods of confinement of one year. Corron appeals, arguing that the district court should have placed him on probation.

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).

We note that the decision to place a defendant on probation is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The goal of probation is to foster the probationer's rehabilitation while protecting public safety. *State v. Gawron*, 112 Idaho 841, 843, 736 P.2d 1295, 1297 (1987); *State v. Cheatham*, 159 Idaho 856, 858, 367 P.3d 251, 253 (Ct. App. 2016). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate.

Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Corron's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.