IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53587

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: October 19, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
CHOLEIGH DANIELLE JONES,	)	**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. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for trafficking in methamphetamine and consecutive, unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for concealment of evidence, affirmed.

Silvey Law Office, LTD; Greg S. Silvey, 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

Choleigh Danielle Jones pled guilty to trafficking in methamphetamine, I.C. §§ 37-2732b(a)(4)(A) and 18-204, and concealment of evidence, I.C. §§ 18-2603 and 19-2520. In exchange for her guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed and the State agreed not to pursue an allegation that she is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Jones to a unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for trafficking in methamphetamine and a consecutive, unified term of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for concealment of evidence. The district court also ordered that Jones's

sentences be served consecutively to other unrelated sentences. Jones appeals, arguing that her 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, Jones's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.