

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 47996

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: May 19, 2021**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **JARROD CHRISTOPHER FIFE,**) **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. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for trafficking in heroin; concurrent determinate term of five years for unlawful possession of a firearm; and being a persistent violator, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentences, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Erik R. Lehtinen, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Jarrold Christopher Fife pled guilty to trafficking in heroin, I.C. § 37-2732B(a)(6)(B); unlawful possession of a firearm, I.C. § 18-3316; and being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Fife to a unified term of twenty years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for trafficking in heroin and a concurrent determinate term of five years for unlawful possession of a

firearm, including the enhancement for being a persistent violator. Fife filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Fife appeals, arguing that his sentences are excessive and that the district court erred in denying his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentences.¹

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

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

¹ Fife also pled guilty to and was sentenced for misdemeanor resisting or obstructing an officer and misdemeanor driving under the influence. However, he does not challenge these judgments of conviction or sentences on appeal.