

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45326

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: July 3, 2018**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **SKYLER ERIC PULLEY,**)
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

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 five years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for two counts of criminal possession of a financial transaction card, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed; and order relinquishing jurisdiction, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Skyler Eric Pulley pled guilty to two counts of criminal possession of a financial transaction card. Idaho Code § 18-3125(4). The district court sentenced Pulley to concurrent sentences of five years with two years determinate, and retained jurisdiction. Pulley filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reconsideration, which was denied by the district court. The district court also relinquished jurisdiction. Pulley appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence, by relinquishing jurisdiction, and by denying the I.C.R. 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 and need not be repeated here. *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.

We note that the decision to place a defendant on probation or whether, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction over the defendant is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that Pulley has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion in relinquishing jurisdiction.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Pulley'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). Upon review of the record, including any new information submitted with Pulley's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

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

