

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52518

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: February 3, 2026
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
MARIAH BRYANN RODRIGUEZ,) 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. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fourteen years with a minimum period of confinement of four years for grand theft, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Stacey M. Donohue, 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; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Mariah Bryann Rodriguez pled guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(1)(b), 18-2409; and sexual exploitation of a child by electronic means (misdemeanor), I.C. § 18-1507A(4). The district court sentenced Rodriguez to a blended juvenile and adult unified sentence of fourteen years with four years determinate for grand theft, and credit for time served for misdemeanor sexual exploitation of a child by electronic means. Rodriguez appeals, contending that her sentence for grand theft is excessive.¹

¹ Rodriguez does not appeal her misdemeanor sentence.

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