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

## **Docket No. 46796**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
Plaintiff-Respondent,	) Filed: October 21, 2019
	) Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk
<b>v.</b>	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
SCOTT ALAN MARTIN,	) 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. Nancy Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years with a one-year determinate term for possession of methamphetamine with a persistent violator enhancement, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge; and BRAILSFORD, Judge

and DKAILSI OKD, Judge

## PER CURIAM

Scott Alan Martin was found guilty of possession of methamphetamine with a persistent violator enhancement. Idaho Code §§ 37-2732(c), 19-2514. The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years with a one-year determinate term. Martin was granted post-conviction relief, and an amended judgment of conviction was filed to allow Martin additional time to file an appeal. Martin 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, Martin's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.