

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52018

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: September 29, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JONATHAN DAVID TOWERY,)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)	
<hr/>		

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Barbara Duggan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two and one-half years, for trafficking marijuana, 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 HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Jonathan David Towery pled guilty to trafficking marijuana, more than one pound, but less than five pounds, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(1)(A). In exchange for his guilty plea, the State amended his charge from trafficking marijuana, five pounds or more, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(1)(B). The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two and one-half years. Towery appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive and

specifically requests his sentence be reduced to a unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of incarceration of one year.¹

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

¹ Towery filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. The denial of the Rule 35 motion is not at issue in this appeal.