

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 40879

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2014 Unpublished Opinion No. 409 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: March 11, 2014 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| MARCUS IAN MEDINA, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| |) | OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) | BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| |) | |

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bingham County. Hon. Darren B. Simpson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of eighteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of eight years, for three counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentences, 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, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Marcus Ian Medina pled guilty to three counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen. I.C. § 18-1506. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Medina to concurrent unified terms of eighteen years, with minimum periods of confinement of eight years. Medina filed an I.C.R 35 motion, which the district court denied. Medina 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 Medina'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, Medina's judgment of conviction and sentences, and the district court's order denying Medina's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.