

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41055

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 321
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: January 13, 2014
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
KEITH WILLIAM BIZAUSKAS,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Dane H. Watkins, Jr., District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of thirty years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for lewd conduct with a child; twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for forcible sexual penetration by use of a foreign object; and ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for sexual exploitation of a child, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

Before LANSING, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Keith William Bizauskas pled guilty to lewd conduct with a child under sixteen, I.C. § 18-1508; forcible sexual penetration by use of a foreign object, I.C. § 18-6608; and sexual exploitation of a child, I.C. § 18-1507A. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Bizauskas to a unified term of thirty years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for lewd conduct with a child; a concurrent unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for forcible sexual penetration by use of a foreign object; and a concurrent unified term of ten years, with a

minimum period of confinement of five years, for sexual exploitation of a child. Bizauskas filed an I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of his sentences, which the district court denied. Bizauskas appeals, asserting that his sentences are 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, Bizauskas's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.