

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51682

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	Filed: May 27, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)	
	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
SCOTT CHRISTOPHER BRUCK,	)	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. Cheri C. Copsey, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance with a persistent violator enhancement, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and TRIBE, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Scott Christopher Bruck was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance.<sup>1</sup> Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). Bruck also admitted to being a persistent violator. I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Bruck to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, and retained jurisdiction. Bruck appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Bruck was also found guilty of misdemeanor possession of paraphernalia and resisting and obstructing; however, he does not challenge these convictions or sentences on 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, Bruck's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.