

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52699

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 JOSE FRANCISCO SILVA-RAMIREZ,)
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Cassia County. Hon. Blaine P. Cannon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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

Jose Francisco Silva-Ramirez pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Silva-Ramirez to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, to be served consecutively to an unrelated sentence. The district court retained jurisdiction and sent Silva-Ramirez to participate in the rider program. Following completion of his rider the district court suspended the sentence and placed Silva-Ramirez on probation. Silva-Ramirez 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 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, Silva-Ramirez's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.