

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 51918/51919/51920/51921

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: September 2, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
BOBBY JACK KING, JR.,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Elmore County. Hon. Theodore J. Fleming, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate sentences of thirty years with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years for enticing of children over the internet, lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, intimidating a witness, and battery upon a law enforcement officer including misdemeanor battery, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated appeals, Bobby Jack King, Jr. pled guilty to enticing of children over the internet, Idaho Code § 18-1509A; lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, I.C. § 18-1508; intimidating, impeding, or preventing the attendance of a witness, I.C. § 18-2604; battery upon a law enforcement officer and battery (misdemeanor), I.C. §§ 18-915(3)(b), 18-903(a) and/or (b). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed sentences totaling thirty years with fifteen years determinate. King appeals, contending 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, King's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.