

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52277

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: March 4, 2026**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **DAVID LLOYD PEARSON,**) **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. Berecz, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for trafficking in methamphetamine, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before TRIBE, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

David Lloyd Pearson pled guilty to an amended charge of trafficking in methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732B(a)(4)(A). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Pearson to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years. Pearson filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied.¹ Pearson appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

¹ On appeal, Pearson does not challenge the district court’s denial of his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence.

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, Pearson's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.