

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52440

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: August 18, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
EDWARD QUINTANA,) 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. Annie O. McDevitt, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for robbery and concurrent, determinate sentence of five years for unlawful possession of a firearm, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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; TRIBE, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Edward Quintana pled guilty to robbery, I.C. §§ 18-6501 and 18-6502, and unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed and the State agreed not to pursue an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Quintana to a unified term of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of eight years, for robbery and a concurrent, determinate term of five years for unlawful possession of a firearm. Quintana appeals, arguing that his sentences are 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, Quintana's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.