IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53548

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: October 16, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
RICHARD G. COWELL, III,	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Susie S. Jensen, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twenty-two years, with minimum periods of confinement of seventeen years, for conspiracy to commit lewd conduct with a minor and lewd conduct with a minor under the age of sixteen, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before TRIBE, Chief Judge; LORELLO Judge;
and PETTY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Richard G. Cowell, III, pled guilty to conspiracy to commit lewd conduct , I.C. § 18-1701, and entered an *Alford*[1] plea to lewd conduct with a child under sixteen, I.C. § 18-1508. The district court sentenced Cowell to concurrent, unified terms of twenty-two years, with minimum periods

---

[1] *See North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

of confinement of seventeen years. Cowell filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Cowell appeals, arguing 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). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Cowell's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.