

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51226

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: July 9, 2024**
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
 CHRISTOPHER DEAN PERALES,) **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. Gene A. Petty, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years with a minimum period of confinement of three years for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, 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

Christopher Dean Perales pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified term of seven years with three years determinate, suspended the sentence, and placed Perales on probation for a period of four years on the condition that he complete Veteran’s Court. Perales filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35(a) asserting his sentence is illegal and the district court denied the motion.¹ Perales appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive.

¹ The denial of the Rule 35(a) motion is not an issue in this 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, Perales' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.