

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52219

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: October 20, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
MATTHEW BEN DAVIS,	) 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 J. O'Neill, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of thirty years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for aggravated battery with a deadly weapon, 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 HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Matthew Ben Davis pled guilty to aggravated battery with a deadly weapon. I.C. §§ 18-903(a) and 18-907(1)(a) and/or (b). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Davis to a unified term of thirty years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years. Davis filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Davis appeals, arguing 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, Davis's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.