

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47340

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: August 28, 2020</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
<b>RODNEY MATTHEW BURKHEAD,</b>	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Defendant-Appellant.</b>	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for felony domestic battery in the presence of a child and being a persistent violator, affirmed.

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

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jeff Nye, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before GRATTON, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Rodney Matthew Burkhead was found guilty of felony domestic battery in the presence of a child. I.C. §§ 18-918(2), 18-903(a), and 18-918(4). Burkhead admitted to being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Burkhead to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years. Burkhead filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Burkhead appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive and that the district court erred in denying his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence.

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 Burkhead'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 Burkhead's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

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