

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52455

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	Filed: November 17, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)	
	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
CRYSTAL LYNN SCHRECENGOST,	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Second Judicial District, State of Idaho, Nez Perce County. Hon. Michelle M. Evans, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of seven years, with minimum periods of confinement of three years, for two counts of possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, 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

Crystal Lynn Schrecengost entered an *Alford*¹ plea to one count of possession of a controlled substance and pled guilty to one count of possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for her guilty pleas, the State dismissed an allegation that Schrecengost was a persistent violator and agreed to dismiss probation violations in two unrelated

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

cases. The district court sentenced Schrecengost to concurrent, unified terms of seven years, with minimum periods of confinement of three years. Schrecengost appeals, arguing that her 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, Schrecengost's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.