

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48574

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
) **Filed: August 18, 2021**
)
) **Plaintiff-Respondent,**)
) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
) **v.**)
) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **AMY ROSE BONNING, aka AMY ROSE**) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **INGRAM,**) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
)
) **Defendant-Appellant.**)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Emily M. Joyce, 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

Amy Rose Bonning, aka Amy Rose Ingram, entered an *Alford*¹ plea to possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver. I.C. § 37-2732(a). In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed, including an allegation that she is a persistent violator.

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

The district court sentenced Bonning to a unified term of six years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, to be served concurrently with an unrelated sentence. Bonning filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Bonning 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). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020). 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 Bonning'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 Bonning's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

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