

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41285

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 561 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: June 11, 2014 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| CHEYNA SWIFT, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| |) | OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) | BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| |) | |

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Stephen S. Dunn, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Cheyna Swift pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court sentenced Swift to a unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two and one-half years. Swift appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence.

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, Swift's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.