## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## Docket No. 50979

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: February 21, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
MELISSA K. PERKES,	) 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. Darren B. Simpson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified life sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of twenty-four years, for second degree murder, <u>affirmed</u>.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; John C. McKinney, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Melissa K. Perkes entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to second degree murder. I.C. § 18-4003(g). In exchange for her guilty plea, the State agreed to recommend a sentence of no greater than an eighteen-year determinate term and Perkes agreed to recommend no less than a five-year determinate term, with both sides free to argue the indeterminate term. The district court sentenced Perkes to a unified term of life imprisonment, with a minimum period of confinement of twenty-

See North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

four years. Perkes filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Perkes appeals, arguing that her 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, Perkes's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.