

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

**Docket No. 51844**

<b>STATE OF IDAHO,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Filed: February 10, 2025</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>JAMES EDWARD WHITMORE,</b>	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Jonathan Medema, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years with a minimum period of confinement of one year for felony domestic violence or battery, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, 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**

James Edward Whitmore pled guilty to felony domestic violence or battery, Idaho Code §§ 18-918(2), 18-903(a) and two counts of violation of a no contact order, I.C. § 18-920. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he was a persistent violator. The district court imposed a unified sentence of six years with one year determinate for the felony domestic violence or battery charge.<sup>1</sup> Whitmore appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive.

---

<sup>1</sup> On appeal, Whitmore does not contest his judgment of conviction or sentences for violation of a no contact order.

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