

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52434

|                         |   |                                 |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO,         | ) |                                 |
|                         | ) | <b>Filed: November 17, 2025</b> |
| Plaintiff-Respondent,   | ) |                                 |
|                         | ) | <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b> |
| v.                      | ) |                                 |
|                         | ) | <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>   |
| MICHAEL FERNANDO ROBAYO | ) | <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>    |
| PULIDO,                 | ) | <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>    |
|                         | ) |                                 |
| Defendant-Appellant.    | ) |                                 |
|                         | ) |                                 |

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years, for grand theft, 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 HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and TRIBE, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Michael Fernando Robayo Pulido pleaded guilty to one count of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), -2407(1)(b), -2409, -204. In exchange for Robayo Pulido's guilty plea, other charges were dismissed and the State agreed to withhold the filing of additional charges. The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of two years. Robayo Pulido appeals, arguing the sentence imposed 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, Robayo Pulido's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.