

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52489

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: March 4, 2026**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **MATTHEW GENE BALL,**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Valley County. Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, 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 TRIBE, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Matthew Gene Ball pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance (Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1)). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court sentenced Ball to a unified term of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years.¹ Ball appeals, arguing that his sentence 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

¹ This sentence was ordered to run concurrently with the sentence in Ball’s other unrelated case.

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