

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47012

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) **Filed: December 24, 2019**
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Karel A. Lehrman, Clerk**
v.)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
KORY ROBERT PRESCOTT,) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years with a three-year determinate term for felony injury to a child, affirmed; order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; John C. McKinney, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Kory Robert Prescott pled guilty to felony injury to child, Idaho Code § 18-1501(1). The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years with a three-year determinate term. Prescott filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Prescott appeals, arguing the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence and denying his 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 Prescott's Rule 35 motion. A motion for reduction of sentence under Rule 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 Prescott's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

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