

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51034

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: January 28, 2025
)
 v.) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
)
 STEVEN JOSEPH REES,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Roger B. Harris, District Judge.

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

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Steven Joseph Rees was found guilty of burglary.¹ Idaho Code § 18-1401. Rees also admitted to the persistent violator enhancement. I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Rees to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three and one-half years.

¹ Rees was also found guilty of petit theft. Rees does not challenge this conviction or sentence on appeal.

The district court ordered that Rees's sentence run concurrently with the sentences in two additional cases. Rees 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, Rees's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.