

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52036

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: April 29, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
CAMERON JAMES AHRENS,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years with a minimum period of confinement of twelve years for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver and concurrent, determinate sentence of five years for eluding a peace officer, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Stacey M. Donohue, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Cameron James Ahrens pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver and eluding a peace officer, Idaho Code §§ 37-2732(a)(1)(A), 49-1404(2). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court imposed a unified term of twenty-five years with twelve years determinate for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver and a concurrent, unified term of five years determinate for eluding a peace officer. Ahrens 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, Ahrens' judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.