

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 52172/52173

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: November 13, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
THOMAS SCOTT PICKETT,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Derrick O'Neill, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for malicious injury to property and a consecutive five-year indeterminate term for injury to jails, 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; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated appeals, Thomas Scott Pickett pled guilty to malicious injury to property, Idaho Code § 18-7001(2) (Docket No. 52172), and injuring jails, I.C. § 18-7018 (Docket No. 52173). The district court imposed a unified term of five years with two years determinate for malicious injury to property and a consecutive term of five years indeterminate for injury to jails. Pickett 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, Pickett's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.