

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52136

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: May 30, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
VICTOR ENRIQUE PARRA,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Brent L. Whiting, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for eluding a police officer and consecutive unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six months, for destruction of evidence, 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; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Victor Enrique Parra pled guilty to eluding a peace officer, I.C. § 49-1404(2), and destruction of evidence, I.C. § 18-2603. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Parra to a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for eluding a police officer and consecutive unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six months, for destruction of evidence. Parra appeals, arguing 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, Parra's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.