

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 38650

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 734
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	<b>Filed: December 7, 2011</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk</b>
	)	
<b>BALTAZAR HUMBERTO OLIVAS-</b>	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>PEREZ,</b>	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Jerome County. Hon. John K. Butler, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of fifteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of five years, for two counts of trafficking in methamphetamine, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, 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; GUTIERREZ, Judge;  
and MELANSON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Baltazar Humberto Olivas-Perez pled guilty to two counts of trafficking in methamphetamine. I.C. § 37-2732B. In exchange for his guilty pleas, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court sentenced Olivas-Perez to concurrent unified terms of fifteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of five years. Olivas-Perez filed an I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of his sentence, which the district court denied. Olivas-Perez appeals, challenging only the excessiveness of his sentences.

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, Olivas-Perez's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.