

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43205

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 318
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: January 8, 2016
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
SONIAH ROSE EVANS,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Benjamin R. Simpson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, for possession of methamphetamine, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed; order relinquishing jurisdiction, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before MELANSON, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Soniah Rose Evans pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court sentenced Evans to a unified term of three years with one and one-half years determinate, and the court retained jurisdiction. Evans filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. The district court subsequently relinquished jurisdiction and executed the original sentence. Evans appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence, by denying her Rule 35 motion, and by relinquishing jurisdiction.

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 a 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); *Toohill*, 103 Idaho at 568, 650 P.2d at 710.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Evans's Rule 35 motion. A motion for reduction of sentence under I.C.R. 35 is essentially a plea for leniency, addressed to the sound discretion of the court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007). In conducting our review of the grant or denial of a Rule 35 motion, we consider the entire record and apply the same criteria used for determining the reasonableness of the original sentence. *State v. Forde*, 113 Idaho 21, 22, 740 P.2d 63, 64 (Ct. App. 1987); *Lopez*, 106 Idaho at 449-51, 680 P.2d at 871-73. Upon review of the record, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

The decision as to whether to place a defendant on probation or, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction is committed to the discretion of the sentencing court. *State v. Hernandez*, 122 Idaho 227, 230, 832 P.2d 1162, 1165 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 786 P.2d 594 (Ct. App. 1990); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 567, 650 P.2d 707, 709 (Ct. App. 1982). Therefore, a decision to relinquish jurisdiction will not be disturbed on appeal except for an abuse of discretion. *State v. Chapman*, 120 Idaho 466, 816 P.2d 1023 (Ct. App. 1991). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion, and we therefore affirm the order relinquishing jurisdiction.

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in ordering execution of Evans' original sentence, without modification or by denying her Rule 35 motion. Therefore, the order relinquishing jurisdiction and directing execution of Evans' previously suspended sentence and order denying her Rule 35 motion are affirmed.