



882 P.2d 444, 448 (Ct. App. 1994). 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, 822 P.2d 1011 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 650 P.2d 707 (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). Since the district court later modified Lawlor's sentence, pursuant to his Rule 35 motion, we will only review Lawlor's modified sentence for an abuse of discretion. *See State v. McGonigal*, 122 Idaho 939, 940-41, 842 P.2d 275, 276-77 (1992).

Lawlor has the burden of showing a clear abuse of discretion on the part of the district court in failing to further reduce the sentence on his Rule 35 motion. *See State v. Cotton*, 100 Idaho 573, 577, 602 P.2d 71, 75 (1979). Lawlor has failed to show such an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, the order of the district court granting his Rule 35 motion is affirmed.