

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52643

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, ) **Filed: February 10, 2026**  
 )  
 v. ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 TYLER JOHN TIDWELL, ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **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. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver and concurrent, determinate sentence of five years for battery on certain law enforcement personnel, 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 TRIBE, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;  
and LORELLO, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Tyler John Tidwell pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, I.C. § 37-2732(a), and battery on certain law enforcement personnel, I.C. §§ 18-915(3) and 18-903. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Tidwell to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver and a concurrent,

determinate term of five years for battery on certain law enforcement personnel. Tidwell appeals, arguing that his 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, Tidwell's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.