

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 38264

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2012 Unpublished Opinion No. 343
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: February 1, 2012
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
ANTHONY LYN ASHLEY,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Timothy Hansen, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of thirty years, with fifteen years determinate, for grand theft by possession of stolen property; ten years determinate for each of the four remaining counts of grand theft by possession of stolen property; five years determinate for each of six counts of unlawful possession of a firearm; and one year determinate for petit theft by possession of stolen property, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Anthony Lyn Ashley was convicted of six counts of grand theft by possession of stolen property, with a persistent violator enhancement, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403(4), 18-2407(1); six counts of unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316; and petit theft by possession of stolen property, I.C. §§ 18-2403(4), 18-2407(2). The district court sentenced Ashley to concurrent unified sentences of thirty years, with fifteen years determinate, for grand theft by possession of stolen property; ten years determinate for each of the four remaining counts of grand theft by

possession of stolen property; five years determinate for each of six counts of unlawful possession of a firearm; and one year determinate for petit theft by possession of stolen property. Ashley appeals, contending 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, Ashley's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.