

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51966

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: March 25, 2025**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 ) **KEIGAN TODD JOHNSON,** )  
 ) **Defendant-Appellant.** )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Gene A. Petty, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for felony driving under the influence, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kierra W. Mai, 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; LORELLO, Judge;  
and TRIBE, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Keigan Todd Johnson pled guilty to felony driving under the influence, Idaho Code § 18-8005(6). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed and the State agreed not to seek a sentencing enhancement.<sup>1</sup> The district court imposed a unified term of ten years with four years determinate. Johnson appeals, contending that his 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Johnson also pled guilty to driving without privileges, however Johnson does not appeal that conviction and sentence.

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