

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 38553

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 666
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: October 18, 2011
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
LARRY JEAN TANNAHILL,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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 twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of fourteen years, for second degree kidnapping and concurrent determinate term of ten years for felony domestic violence, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Jordan E. Taylor, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Larry Jean Tannahill pled guilty to second degree kidnapping, I.C. §§ 18-4501 and 18-4503, and felony domestic violence, I.C. §§ 18-903 and 18-918(2)(a). The district court sentenced Tannahill to a unified term of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of fourteen years, for second degree kidnapping and a concurrent determinate term of ten years for felony domestic violence. Tannahill 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, Tannahill's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.