IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 53516/53517

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: November 2, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
VICTOR ANTONIO FINNERTY,	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Benjamin J. Cluff, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance in Docket No. 53516, affirmed; and judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for robbery (aid/abet) in Docket No. 53517, 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 FLEMING, Judge

PER CURIAM

This case involves two consolidated appeals. In Docket No. 53516, Victor Antonio Finnerty pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance (Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1)). The district court sentenced Finnerty to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. In Docket No. 53517, Finnerty pled guilty to robbery (aid/abet) (I.C.

§ 18-6501). The district court sentenced Finnerty to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years.[1] Finnerty 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 records in these cases, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Finnerty's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.

---

[1] The district court ordered the sentences in Docket Nos. 53516 and 53517 to run concurrently with each other.