

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51151

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: August 6, 2024
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
BRITTANY ARLENE JENKINS,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Brent L. Whiting, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for felony aggravated driving under the influence, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender; and Katherine C. Ball, Chelsea Wilson and Alex Silveira, University of Idaho Legal Aid Clinic, 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

Brittany Arlene Jenkins entered an *Alford*¹ plea to felony aggravated driving under the influence. I.C. § 18-8006. In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Jenkins to a unified term of fourteen years, with a minimum period of

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

confinement of four years. The district court retained jurisdiction and sent Jenkins to participate in the rider program. Jenkins 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, Jenkins' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.