

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52149

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: June 30, 2025</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
MATTHEWS,	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
	)
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

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

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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

Christopher Michael Matthews pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, Idaho Code § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed and the State agreed not to file a persistent violator charge. The district court imposed a unified term of eight years with two years determinate. Matthews 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

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, Matthews' judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.