IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53118

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: November 17, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
TERRY EDWARD MARTINDALE, JR.,	)	**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. R. William Hancock, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of life, with a minimum period of confinement of thirty-five years, for lewd conduct with a child under the age of sixteen years, 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

Terry Edward Martindale, Jr. was found guilty of lewd conduct with a child under the age of sixteen years, Idaho Code § 18-1508. Following trial, Martindale pled guilty to the Information Part II--a mandatory minimum sentencing enhancement pursuant to I.C. § 19-2520G. The district court sentenced Martindale to a unified sentence of life, with a minimum period of incarceration of thirty-five years. Martindale 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, Martindale's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.