

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 49868

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) Filed: December 15, 2022  
 Plaintiff-Respondent, )  
 ) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk  
 v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 BRETT CHARLES BEEMAN, ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **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 suspended, unified sentence of five years with one year determinate for one count of failure to register as a sex offender, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before GRATTON, Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;  
and BRAILSFORD, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Brett Charles Beeman pled guilty to one count of failure to register as a sex offender, Idaho Code §§ 18-8308(4), 18-8311. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of five years with one year determinate, suspended the sentence, and placed Beeman on probation. Beeman filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence, which was denied. Beeman appeals, contending that his sentence is excessive.

Although Beeman received the sentence he asked for, he asserts that the district court erred in imposing an excessive sentence. 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 Beeman received the sentence he requested, he may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, Beeman's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.