## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 48163**

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: April 2, 2021
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
•	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
<b>v.</b>	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
VICTORIA RACHEL CLARKE,	) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
	) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.	)
	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Elmore County. Hon. James Cawthon, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended, unified sentence of three years with one year determinate for forgery, <u>affirmed</u>.

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

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

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

PER CURIAM

Victoria Rachel Clarke pled guilty to forgery, Idaho Code § 18-3601. In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a suspended, unified sentence of three years with one year determinate and placed Clarke on probation. Clarke appeals, contending that her sentence is excessive.

Although Clarke received the sentence she asked for, she asserts that the district court erred in imposing an excessive sentence. The doctrine of invited error applies to estop a party from asserting an error when his or her own conduct induces the commission of the error. *State v. Atkinson*, 124 Idaho 816, 819, 864 P.2d 654, 657 (Ct. App. 1993). One may not complain of

errors one has consented to or acquiesced in. *State v. Caudill*, 109 Idaho 222, 226, 706 P.2d 456, 460 (1985); *State v. Lee*, 131 Idaho 600, 605, 961 P.2d 1203, 1208 (Ct. App. 1998). In short, invited errors are not reversible. *State v. Gittins*, 129 Idaho 54, 58, 921 P.2d 754, 758 (Ct. App. 1996). This doctrine applies to sentencing decisions as well as rulings made during trial. *State v. Griffith*, 110 Idaho 613, 614, 716 P.2d 1385, 1386 (Ct. App. 1986).

Therefore, because Clarke received the sentence she requested, she may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, Clarke's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.