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

## Docket No. 49222

STATE OF IDAHO,  Plaintiff-Respondent,  v.  JOSE URIEL CUEVAS,  Defendant-Appellant.	<ul> <li>Filed: August 5, 2022</li> <li>Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk</li> <li>THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED</li> <li>OPINION AND SHALL NOT</li> <li>BE CITED AS AUTHORITY</li> </ul>
	he First Judicial District, State of Idaho, n, District Judge.
Order denying I.C.R. 35 motion, <u>affirm</u> Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Box	Public Defender; Elizabeth Ann Allred
Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General, Boise, for responden	ey General; Andrew V. Wake, Deputy nt.
	Judge; HUSKEY, Judge; .SFORD, Judge

PER CURIAM

Jose Uriel Cuevas pled guilty to sexual abuse of a child. Idaho Code § 18-1506(1)(a). The district court sentenced Cuevas to a unified term of twenty years with ten years determinate. Cuevas filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Cuevas appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by denying his I.C.R. 35 motion.

A motion for reduction of sentence under I.C.R. 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 Cuevas's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Cuevas's Rule 35 motion is affirmed.