

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51367

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: May 23, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
COLTON J. HAYNES,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Lemhi County. Hon. Stevan H. Thompson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years, for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kale D. Gans, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Colton J. Haynes pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver. I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Haynes to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years. The district court retained jurisdiction and sent Haynes to participate in the rider program. Following completion of his rider, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Haynes on probation. Haynes appeals, arguing that his suspended 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, Haynes' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.