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

## **Docket No. 51214**

| STATE OF IDAHO,       | )                              |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
|                       | ) Filed: June 13, 2024         |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, | )                              |
|                       | ) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk     |
| v.                    | )                              |
|                       | ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED       |
| JOSHUA PETERSON HALE, | ) OPINION AND SHALL NOT        |
|                       | ) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b> |
| Defendant-Appellant.  | )                              |
|                       | )                              |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eighteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, <u>affirmed</u>.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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; HUSKEY, Judge; and TRIBE, Judge

## PER CURIAM

Joshua Peterson Hale pled guilty to sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, Idaho Code §§ 18-1506, 19-304. The district court imposed a unified term of eighteen years with four years determinate. Hale appeals, contending 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, Hale's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.