



Criminal Rule 35 motion which the district court denied. Williams appeals, contending the district court abused its discretion in denying his I.C.R. 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 an I.C.R. 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). An appeal from the denial of an I.C.R. 35 motion cannot be used as a vehicle to review the underlying sentence absent the presentation of new information. *Id.* Because no new or additional information in support of Williams' I.C.R. 35 motion was presented, the district court did not abuse its discretion.

For the foregoing reasons, the district court's order denying Williams' I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed.