

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 46694

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: December 12, 2019**
)
 v.) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
)
 MELVIN WENDELL BLEDSOE, III,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
 _____)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Scott Wayman, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of thirty years, with a minimum period of confinement of fifteen years, for two counts of felony injury to a child, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Ben P. McGreevy, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Andrew V. Wake, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Melvin Wendell Bledsoe, III, entered an *Alford*¹ plea to two counts of felony injury to a child, each with an infliction of great bodily injury sentencing enhancement. Idaho Code §§ 18-1501(1), 19-2520B. The district court sentenced Bledsoe to concurrent unified sentences of thirty years with fifteen years determinate on each count. Bledsoe filed an Idaho Criminal Rule

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

35 motion, which the district court denied. Bledsoe appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence and by denying the Rule 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. *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.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Bledsoe'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 Bledsoe's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Bledsoe's judgment of conviction and sentences, and the district court's order denying Bledsoe's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.