

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41964

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 827
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: November 25, 2014
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
BRYAN N. MENDOZA,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. George A. Southworth, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for felony driving under the influence, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly E. Smith, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Russell J. Spencer, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Bryan N. Mendoza pled guilty to felony driving under the influence. I.C. §§ 18-8004, 18-8005. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that he was a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Mendoza to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years. Mendoza filed an I.C.R 35 motion, which the district court denied. Mendoza 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, Mendoza's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.