

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51357

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: November 12, 2024**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **v.** )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **CHRISTOPHER GENE JOHNSON,** ) **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. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and a unified sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for domestic violence or battery in the presence of a child, affirmed.

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; LORELLO, Judge  
and TRIBE, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Christopher Gene Johnson was found guilty of domestic violence or battery in the presence of a child. Idaho Code §§ 18-918(2), 18-918(4) and 18-903(a).<sup>1</sup> The district court sentenced Johnson to a unified term of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years and retained jurisdiction. Johnson appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the history of this case, this code section was referred to as 18-903(A), however, the correct code section is 18-903(a).

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, Johnson's judgment of conviction and sentence, are affirmed.