

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 48078/48079/48080

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: November 20, 2020
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
DARRELL LAVERNE BEEDLES,) 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.

Orders denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motions for reduction of sentences, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

In these cases consolidated on appeal, Darrell Laverne Beedles pled guilty to failure to register as a sex offender in 2012 (Docket No. 48078), Idaho Code § 18-8309; providing false information to the sex offense registry in 2013 (Docket No. 48079), I.C. § 18-8311(2); and providing false information to the sex offense registry in 2014 (Docket No. 48080), I.C. § 18-8311(2). The district court imposed consecutive, unified sentences of ten years determinate in Docket No. 48078; ten years indeterminate in Docket No. 48079; and ten years with two years determinate in Docket No. 48080. Following Beedles’ multiple probation violations and multiple periods of retained jurisdiction, the district court ordered execution of Beedles’

sentences, reducing the sentence in Docket No. 48078 for failure to register as a sex offender to ten years with seven years determinate. Beedles filed Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motions for reduction of his sentences, which the district court denied. Beedles appeals.

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 Beedles' Rule 35 motions, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's orders denying Beedles' Rule 35 motions are affirmed.