

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 49748/49749

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 JASON DANIEL MOORE, )  
 )  
 Defendant-Appellant. )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonner County. Hon. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and suspended, concurrent sentences of 365 days in jail with credit for time served for two misdemeanor violations of a no-contact order, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kimberly A. Coster, 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; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

In consolidated cases, Jason Daniel Moore pled guilty to two misdemeanor violations of a no-contact order, Idaho Code § 18-920. In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed concurrent sentences of 365 days in jail with 107 days of credit for time served and suspended the sentences in favor of probation. Moore appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive.

Although Moore received the sentences he requested, he asserts that the district court erred in imposing excessive sentences. 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 Moore received the sentences he requested, he may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, Moore's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.