

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49476

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,) **Filed: April 5, 2023**
)
 v.) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
)
 TOMMY T. TUCKER,) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and sentences for burglary and possession of a controlled substance; and order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

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

PER CURIAM

Tommy T. Tucker pled guilty to burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). As part of a plea agreement, the State agreed to dismiss additional charges and to recommend that the sentences run concurrently with sentences imposed in three other cases. The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, and a unified sentence of five years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, respectively, with the sentences to run consecutively to the sentences imposed in the other three cases. Tucker filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Tucker appeals.

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

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