

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 50998

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: October 11, 2024</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>COREY RICHARD GILLESPIE, II,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years, for felony possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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; LORELLO, Judge  
and TRIBE, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Corey Richard Gillespie, II pled guilty to felony possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years. Gillespie appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Gillespie also pled guilty and was sentenced for petit theft. However, he does not challenge this judgment of conviction and sentence on appeal.

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, Gillespie's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.