

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 45467

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: June 25, 2018**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **v.** )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **RONALD LEE GLAZIER,** ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 ) **Defendant-Appellant.** )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Melissa Moody, District Judge.

Order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Brian R. Dickson, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and LORELLO, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Ronald Lee Glazier pleaded guilty to operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs (one felony conviction within fifteen years), Idaho Code §§ 18-8004, 8005(9), and possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c). For the driving under the influence charge, the district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence, with five years determinate, and for the possession of a controlled substance charge, the district court imposed an indeterminate five-year sentence to run consecutively. Glazier filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Glazier appeals.

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). Upon review of the record, including any new information submitted with Glazier's I.C.R. 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Glazier's I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed.