

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51423

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: January 6, 2025
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 RAFAEL MARTINEZ CISNEROS,) 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. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of thirty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for felony driving under the influence and being a persistent violator, affirmed.

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

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Rafael Martinez Cisneros pled guilty to felony driving under the influence, I.C. §§ 18-8004 and 18-8005(9), and admitted to being a persistent violator of the law, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Cisneros to a unified term of thirty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years. Cisneros filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Cisneros appeals, arguing 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, Cisneros's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.