

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 38720

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 752
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: December 20, 2011
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
DEE WAYNE DYKE,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for grand theft and concurrent unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for burglary, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Diane M. Walker, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Dee Wayne Dyke pled guilty to grand theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), 2407(1)(b), and burglary, I.C. § 18-1401. The district court sentenced Dyke to a unified term of fourteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for grand theft and a concurrent unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for burglary. Dyke appeals.

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, Dyke's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.