IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 53250/53251/53252

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: October 23, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
KENNETH RAY DIAL, JR.,	)	**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.

Judgments of conviction and unified consecutive sentence of life imprisonment, with a minimum period of confinement of forty years, for one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, in Docket No. 53250; unified consecutive sentences of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of five years, for two counts of sexual exploitation of a child, in Docket No. 53251; and unified consecutive sentences of ten years, with minimum periods of confinement of five years, for three counts of sexual exploitation of a child, in Docket No. 53252, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, 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; FLEMING, Judge;
and PETTY, Judge

PER CURIAM

This case involves three consolidated appeals. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Kenneth Ray Dial, Jr. pled guilty to one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, Idaho Code

§ 18-1508 (Docket No. 53250);[1] two counts of sexual exploitation of a child, I.C. § 18-1507(2)(a) (Docket No. 53251); and three counts of sexual exploitation of a child, I.C. § 18-1507(2)(a) (Docket No. 53252). In exchange for his guilty pleas, the remaining charges in these cases were dismissed. The plea agreement also included three cases in another county in which Dial agreed to plead guilty to three counts of child sexual abuse, five counts of lewd conduct, one count of witness intimidation, and two counts of possession of sexual exploitation of a child, and the State agreed to dismiss the remaining charges in those cases. In Docket No. 53250, the district court sentenced Dial to a unified term of life imprisonment, with a minimum period of confinement of forty years, for one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen.[2] In Docket No. 53251, the district court sentenced Dial to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for each count of sexual exploitation of a child.[3] In Docket No. 53252, the district court sentenced Dial to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for each count of sexual exploitation of a child.[4] Dial 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-

---

[1] Dial entered his plea to one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen as an *Alford* plea. *See North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

[2] This sentence was ordered to run consecutively to all underlying cases.

[3] The sentence for the first count in this case was ordered to run consecutively to the sentence in Docket No. 53250. The sentence for the second count in this case was ordered to run consecutively to the sentence for the first count in this case and consecutively to the sentence in Docket No. 53250.

[4] The sentence for the first count in this case was ordered to run consecutively to the sentences for both counts in Docket No. 53251 and consecutively to the sentence in Docket No. 53250. The sentence for the second count in this case was ordered to run consecutively to the first count in this case and consecutively to the sentences for both counts in Docket No. 53251 and consecutively to the sentence in Docket No. 53250. The sentence for the third count in this case was ordered to run consecutively to the first and second counts in this case and consecutively to the sentences for both counts in Docket No. 53251 and consecutively to the sentence in Docket No. 53250.

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 records in these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, Dial's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.