

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52767

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: November 17, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
LORI ANN JOHNSON,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Thomas W. Whitney, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twelve years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years, for two counts of delivery of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Abigail E. Schulz, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Lori Ann Johnson pled guilty to two counts of delivery of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). In exchange for her guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Johnson to concurrent, unified terms of twelve years, with minimum periods of confinement of two years. Johnson appeals, arguing that her 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, Johnson's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.