

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46673

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: January 10, 2020**
)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Amanda Nichole Ravellette was found guilty of possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c)(1). At the sentencing hearing, Ravellette’s counsel asked the district court to impose a “fixed term of no more than three years, and that the total sentence be no more than five” years and that the sentence run concurrently to what she was already serving. The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, to run concurrently with Ravellette’s prior sentences. Ravellette appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive.

Although Ravellette received the sentence that her counsel asked the district court to impose, she 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 Ravellette received the sentence she requested, she may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, her judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.