

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43301

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 362
)
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: February 1, 2016
)
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)
ROBERT MANUEL CERINO,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. David C. Nye, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for second degree kidnapping, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Nevin, Benjamin, McKay & Bartlett, LLP; Deborah Whipple, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Robert Manuel Cerino pled guilty to second degree kidnapping. I.C. § 18-4503. The district court sentenced Cerino to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years. Cerino filed an I.C.R 35 motion, which the district court denied. Cerino appeals.

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.

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). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Cerino'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.

Therefore, Cerino's judgment of conviction and sentence, and the district court's order denying Cerino's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.