

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 38245/38258

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 618
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	<b>Filed: September 15, 2011</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk</b>
	)	
<b>PHILLIP CHARLES CARRINGER,</b>	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Stephen S. Dunn, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for possession of methamphetamine; and five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for unlawful possession of a firearm, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth Ann Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated appeals, Phillip Charles Carringer pled guilty to possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1), unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316, and domestic battery, I.C. § 18-918(b). The district court sentenced Carringer to concurrent unified sentences of seven years with four years determinate for possession of methamphetamine; five years with two years determinate for unlawful possession of a firearm; and one year determinate for domestic battery. Carringer appeals asserting that the district court

abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences without properly considering the mitigating factors that exist in these cases.<sup>1</sup>

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, Carringer's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carringer does not appeal his sentence on the misdemeanor domestic battery charge.