

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48038

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: April 15, 2021</b>
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
CYNTHIA ANN HUNNICUTT,	) <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. Lynn G. Norton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eighteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for felony driving under the influence and being a persistent violator, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Cynthia Ann Hunnicutt was found guilty of felony driving under the influence. I.C. § 18-8005(9). Following the guilty verdict, Hunnicutt admitted to being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514, and an additional charge of driving without privileges was dismissed. The district court sentenced Hunnicutt to a unified term of eighteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, to run concurrently with an unrelated sentence. Hunnicutt filed an I.C.R. 35 motion,

which the district court denied. Hunnicutt appeals, arguing that her sentence is excessive and that the district court erred in denying her 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 Hunnicutt'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 Hunnicutt's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

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