

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41484

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 628
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: July 17, 2014
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DAVID CHARLES LOOMIS,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED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. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified life sentence with thirty-year determinate term for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, and concurrent fifteen-year determinate sentence for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

David Charles Loomis pled guilty to one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1508, and one count of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, I.C. § 18-1506(1)(a). The district court imposed a unified sentence of life with thirty years determinate on the lewd conduct charge and a concurrent fifteen-year determinate term on the sexual abuse charge. Loomis appeals, contending that his sentences are 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 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, Loomis's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.