

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50823

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: October 29, 2024**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **CRAIG DAVID STRASBURG,**) **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. Derrick J. O'Neill, 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 with a persistent violator enhancement, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Mark W. Olson, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; LORELLO, Judge
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Craig David Strasburg was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance. Idaho Code § 37-2732(c).¹ Strasburg admitted to an enhancement of being a persistent violator of the law. I.C. § 19-2513. The district court sentenced Strasburg to a unified term of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, and retained jurisdiction. Following Strasburg's

¹ Strasburg was also found guilty of misdemeanor possession of paraphernalia. However, he does not challenge this conviction and sentence on appeal.

period of retained jurisdiction, the sentence was suspended. Strasburg appeals, arguing that his determinate 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, Strasburg's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.