

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51813

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: March 31, 2025</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>CHEYENNE T. HENNINGS,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Gabriel McCarthy, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six months, for failure to register as a sexual offender, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender; Katherine C. Ball and Kevinesha Lewis, University of Idaho Legal Aid Clinic, 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

Cheyenne T. Hennings pled guilty to failure to register as a sexual offender. I.C. § 18-8307. The district court sentenced Hennings to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six months. Hennings 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, Hennings' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.