

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52628

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| |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |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

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Lynn G. Norton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of one year, for grand theft, 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 HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Patrick Dean Wilkinson pled guilty to grand theft, Idaho Code § 18-2403(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of one year, to run consecutively to another sentence in a separate case. Wilkinson appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive, and the district court should have ordered his sentences to run concurrently.

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