

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 41901

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2015 Unpublished Opinion No. 421
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)	<b>Filed: March 18, 2015</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk</b>
	)	
MIGUEL TORRES-URBINA,	)	<b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
	)	<b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)	<b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and aggregate unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years, for four counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years and one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth Ann Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

---

Before LANSING, Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;  
and GRATTON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Miguel Torres-Urbina was found guilty of four counts of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen years, Idaho Code § 18-1506; and one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, I.C. 18-1508. The district court sentenced Torres-Urbina to an aggregate unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of seven years. Torres-Urbina filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Torres-Urbina appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences 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 Torres-Urbina'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, Torres-Urbina's judgment of conviction and sentences, and the district court's order denying Torres-Urbina's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.