

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52446

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: September 26, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JAMES ALLEN HARVEY,)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)	
<hr/>		

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Cassia County. Hon. Blaine P. Cannon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of incarceration of six years, for two counts of incest, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

James Allen Harvey entered *Alford*¹ pleas to two counts of incest, Idaho Code § 18-6601. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. On the first count, the district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of incarceration of six years. On the second count, the district court imposed an indeterminate sentence of five years, to run consecutively to the first count, resulting in an aggregate sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of incarceration of six years. Harvey appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive.

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

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, Harvey's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.