

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51868

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	Filed: December 1, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)	
	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
STEVEN ROBERT KUSCHNICK,	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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

Steven Robert Kuschnick was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c).<sup>1</sup> The district court sentenced Kuschnick to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year; however, the district court suspended the sentence and placed him on probation for four years. Kuschnick appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kuschnick was also found guilty of possession of drug paraphernalia; however, he does not challenge this conviction or sentence on appeal.

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