

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51822

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: February 28, 2025
)
 v.) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
)
 ARREN HUNTER TRUJILLO,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Thomas W. Whitney, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified terms of fifteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of seven years, for aggravated assault (with an enhancement for use of a deadly weapon) and unlawful discharge of a firearm, 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 HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Arren Hunter Trujillo pled guilty to one count of aggravated assault, Idaho Code § 18-905 (with an enhancement for use of a deadly weapon, I.C. § 19-2520) and one count of unlawful discharge of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3317. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Trujillo to unified terms of fifteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of seven years, for each count. The sentence for aggravated assault was ordered to run concurrently with the sentence for unlawful discharge of a firearm. Trujillo appeals, arguing that his sentences are 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, Trujillo's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.