

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50856

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: October 16, 2024**  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 SETH LESLIE RAWSON, ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bingham County. Hon. Stevan H. Thompson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years, for burglary, affirmed.

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

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kale D. Gans, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and TRIBE, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Seth Leslie Rawson pled guilty to burglary. I.C. § 18-1401. In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed as well as an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Rawson to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years. Rawson filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Rawson appeals, arguing that his 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, Rawson's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.