

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51125

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: November 12, 2024
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 THOMAS AARON WARREN,) 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. Michael J. Reardon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and determinate sentence of five years, for felony malicious injury to property, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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

Thomas Aaron Warren pled guilty to felony malicious injury to property. Idaho Code § 18-7001(2). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court placed Warren on probation and withheld judgment for a period of four years. Subsequently, Warren admitted to violating the terms of probation, and the district court consequently revoked the order withholding judgment, revoked probation, and sentenced Warren to a determinate term

of five years.¹ On appeal, Warren does not challenge the district court's decision to revoke the withheld judgment or probation but argues only 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, Warren's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

¹ Warren's sentence was ordered to run concurrently with the sentences of two unrelated cases.