

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45291

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: August 29, 2018</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
EDDIE DEAN TACKETT,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Scott Wayman, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and LORELLO, Judge  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Eddie Dean Tackett was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, Idaho Code § 37-2732(a)(1)(A). The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, suspended the sentence and placed Tackett on supervised probation. Tackett appeals, contending that his 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, Tackett's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.