

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48734

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) <b>Filed: February 9, 2022</b>
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) <b>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</b>
v.	)
	) <b>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</b>
DWAYNE ALLAN BRADLEY,	) <b>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</b>
	) <b>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</b>
Defendant-Appellant.	)
_____	)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Lansing L. Haynes, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years with eight years determinate for felony vehicular manslaughter, 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 LORELLO, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;  
 and BRAILSFORD, Judge  
 \_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM

Dwayne Allan Bradley entered an *Alford*<sup>1</sup> plea to felony vehicular manslaughter, Idaho Code § 18-4006(3)(b). In exchange for his guilty plea, an allegation that Bradley was a persistent violator was dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of fifteen years with eight years determinate, to run concurrently with Bradley’s sentence in a separate case. Bradley filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Bradley appeals.

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

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

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