

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51708

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: November 10, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
PAUL JAMES POTTS,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Benewah County. Hon. Barbara Duggan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years with a minimum period of confinement of ten years for trafficking in methamphetamine, with a persistent violator enhancement, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, 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

Paul James Potts was found guilty of trafficking in methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(4), misdemeanor possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(3), and Potts admitted to being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court imposed a unified term of twenty years with ten years determinate for the trafficking in methamphetamine charge and persistent violator enhancement and awarded credit for time served for the misdemeanor

possession of a controlled substance charge.¹ Potts appeals, contending 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, Potts' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

¹ Potts does not appeal from the misdemeanor conviction and sentence.