

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51727

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: June 18, 2025</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
MAJORJON ALLEN KAYLOR,	) <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, Shoshone County. Hon. Barbara Duggan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and four determinate life sentences for four counts of second degree murder, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, 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

Majorjon Allen Kaylor pled guilty to four counts of second degree murder, Idaho Code § 18-4003(g). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court imposed four determinate life sentences. Kaylor filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion which was denied by the district court.<sup>1</sup> Kaylor 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The denial of Kaylor's Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion is not at issue in this appeal.

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, Kaylor's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.