

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 52053/52054/52055

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: October 6, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
RONALD THURMAN CHILDERS, II,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Boundary County. Hon. Lamont C. Berez, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and aggregate, unified sentences of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for enticing a child through the internet or other communication device, affirmed.

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

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated appeals, Ronald Thurman Childers, II, pled guilty to three counts of enticing a child through the internet or other communication device, Idaho Code § 18-1509A(1). In exchange for his guilty pleas, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court imposed an aggregate term of fifteen years with ten years determinate. Childers 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, Childers' judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.