

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51673

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: May 20, 2025</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
JEANINE ANN LINTON,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Susie Jensen, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of two years with a minimum period of confinement of one year for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

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

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Jeanine Ann Linton entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1), and pled guilty to misdemeanor charges of possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(3), and possession of paraphernalia, I.C. § 37-2734A(1). The district court imposed a unified term of two years with one year determinate, credited Linton for time served on the misdemeanors, and retained jurisdiction. Linton filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35

<sup>1</sup> See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

motion which the district court denied.<sup>2</sup> Following the period of retained jurisdiction, Linton was placed on probation. Linton appeals, contending that her 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, Linton's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

---

<sup>2</sup> The denial of the Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion is not at issue in this appeal.