

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 37310

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 390
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: March 15, 2011
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DOUGLAS RANDALL HALL,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Thomas F. Neville, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, for felony malicious injury to property, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Diane M. Walker, 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, LANSING, Judge
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Douglas Randall Hall was convicted of felony malicious injury to property, Idaho Code § 18-7001(2).¹ The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year. Hall appeals, contending that the 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 a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

¹ Hall was also convicted and sentenced for several related misdemeanors but is appealing only the malicious injury to property sentence.

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, Hall's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.