IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 40558

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	**2013 Unpublished Opinion No. 559**
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	**Filed: July 1, 2013**
	)	
v.	)	**Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk**
	)	
TRAVIS EUGENE ROACH, aka RAVIS ROACH, EUGENE ROACH MOTEL,	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED OPINION AND SHALL NOT BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
	)	
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cheri C. Copsey, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with one year determinate, for burglary, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben Patrick McGreevy, 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; GRATTON, Judge; and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Travis Eugene Roach, aka Ravis Roach, Eugene Roach Motel, plead guilty to burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and petit theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403(1), 18-2407(2). The district court sentenced Roach to a unified term of ten years, with one year determinate, for the burglary conviction and a concurrent sentence of time served for the petit theft conviction. Roach appeals, contending his unified sentence of ten years, with one year determinate, 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 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, Roach's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.