

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51837

STATE OF IDAHO,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

ANNA MARIE BOOTHBY,

Defendant-Appellant.

)

) Filed: June 25, 2025

)

) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk

)

) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED

) OPINION AND SHALL NOT

) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY

)

)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, for possession of a controlled substance with a persistent violator enhancement, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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; LORELLO, Judge
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Anna Marie Boothby was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance.¹ Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). Boothby admitted to a persistent violator enhancement. I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Boothby to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of

¹ Boothby was also found guilty of possession of drug paraphernalia; however, she does not challenge this conviction or sentence on appeal.

confinement of one and one-half years. Boothby filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied.² Boothby appeals, arguing that her 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, Boothby's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.

² On appeal, Boothby does not challenge the district court's denial of her Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence.