IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53479

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: October 23, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
ABU J. HARRIS,	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Javier L. Gabiola, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven and one-half years, for enticing a child through the internet or other communication device, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Abigael E. Schulz, 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

Abu J. Harris pled guilty to enticing a child through the internet or other communication device, Idaho Code § 18-1509A. The district court sentenced Harris to a unified term of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven and one-half years and retained jurisdiction. Harris appeals, arguing that his sentence 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). 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, Harris's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.