## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 46155**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
Plaintiff-Respondent,	) Filed: April 10, 2019 )
	) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
<b>v.</b>	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
RACHELL LYNN RUDOLPH,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years with a one and one-half-year determinate term for possession of methamphetamine, <u>affirmed</u>.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenevieve C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

\_\_\_\_

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; LORELLO, Judge; and BRAILSFORD, Judge

## PER CURIAM

Rachell L. Rudolph pled guilty to possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c). Prior to sentencing, Rudolph was charged with committing additional crimes in violation of the plea agreement. The district court imposed a unified seven-year sentence with a one and one-half-year determinate term. Rudolph appeals, contending that her 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, Rudolph's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.