

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46227

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: March 8, 2019**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
 v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
) **MONICA LEANNE SALINAS,**)
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. Christopher S. Nye, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for aggravated battery, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Monica Leanne Salinas pleaded guilty to aggravated battery, Idaho Code §§ 18-803(a), 18-907(b). The district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years, with five years determinate. Salinas appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive.

Although Salinas received the sentence she requested, Salinas asserts that the district court erred in imposing an excessive sentence. The doctrine of invited error applies to estop a party from asserting an error when his or her own conduct induces the commission of the error. *State v. Atkinson*, 124 Idaho 816, 819, 864 P.2d 654, 657 (Ct. App. 1993). One may not complain of errors one has consented to or acquiesced in. *State v. Caudill*, 109 Idaho 222, 226,

706 P.2d 456, 460 (1985); *State v. Lee*, 131 Idaho 600, 605, 961 P.2d 1203, 1208 (Ct. App. 1998). In short, invited errors are not reversible. *State v. Gittins*, 129 Idaho 54, 58, 921 P.2d 754, 758 (Ct. App. 1996). This doctrine applies to sentencing decisions as well as rulings made during trial. *State v. Griffith*, 110 Idaho 613, 614, 716 P.2d 1385, 1386 (Ct. App. 1986).

Therefore, because Salinas received the sentence she requested, she may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, Salinas's judgment of conviction and sentence is affirmed.