

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43056

STATE OF IDAHO, ) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 317  
)  
Plaintiff-Respondent, ) Filed: January 8, 2016  
)  
v. ) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk  
)  
ANTHONY MICHAEL MATNEY, ) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED  
) OPINION AND SHALL NOT  
Defendant-Appellant. ) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY  
)  

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Juneal C. Kerrick, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-five years, with a minimum period of confinement of six and one-half years, for felony operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

---

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;  
and HUSKEY, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Anthony Michael Matney pled guilty to felony operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol, Idaho Code § 18-8004, with sentencing enhancement. The district court sentenced Matney to a unified term of twenty-five years with six and one-half years determinate. Matney filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Matney appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence and by denying his Rule 35 motion.

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