

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53303

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: April 8, 2026
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
 v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 CHRISTOPHER DANIEL HAYES,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Barry McHugh, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of twelve years, for enticing through the internet, video, image or communication device to lure a child under sixteen, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Christopher Daniel Hayes pled guilty to enticing through the internet, video, image or communication device to lure a child under sixteen. I.C. § 18-1509A(1). The district court sentenced Hayes to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of twelve years. Hayes 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, Hayes's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.