

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41348

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 681
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	<b>Filed: August 20, 2014</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk</b>
	)	
ANTONIO MARREAL JONES,	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years, for procurement of prostitution, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Reed P. Anderson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before GUTIERREZ, Chief Judge; LANSING, Judge;  
and GRATTON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Antonio Marreal Jones pled guilty to procurement of prostitution. I.C. §§ 18-5602, 18-5613. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Jones to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years. Jones filed an I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of his sentence, which the district court denied. Jones appeals.

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). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Jones's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.