

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41021

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 593
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: June 25, 2014
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DANIEL E. MORRIS,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Renae J. Hoff, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of twenty years with ten years determinate for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, and fifteen years with five years determinate for possession of sexually exploitative material, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Shawn F. Wilkerson, 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 MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Daniel E. Morris was convicted of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and possession of sexually exploitative material, I.C. § 18-1507A. The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of twenty years with ten years determinate for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, and fifteen years with five years determinate for possession of sexually exploitative material. Morris filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence, which he later withdrew. Morris appeals, contending that his lewd conduct 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). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

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